# DOCUMENT RESUME

| | |
|---|---|
| ED 204 595 | CE 029 532 |
| AUTHOR | Newton, Mark, Comp.; Cox, Sterling, Comp. |
| TITLE | 1979 Fall Leadership Conference for State Directors of Vocational Education. Charting a Course of Excellence for Vocational Education in the 1980s (Scottsdale, Arizona, September 24-27, 1979). |
| INSTITUTION | Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education. |
| PUB DATE | 79 |
| NOTE | 95p.; Funded by the National Vocational Education Professional Development Consortium, Inc. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC04 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Administrator Attitudes; Educational Change; Educational Improvement; Educational Legislation; Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; Educational Practices; Educational Research; Educational Responsibility; *Educational Trends; Federal Legislation; *Futures (of Society); Linking Agents; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; State Programs; Trend Analysis; *Vocational Education |
| IDENTIFIERS | Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education; Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; National Institute of Education |

ABSTRACT

These proceedings of a conference for state directors of vocational education on the topic of charting a course of excellence for vocational education in the 1980s consist of the texts of 13 conference papers, the conference agenda, and a listing of program presentations and participants. Topics of the first group of papers, which all revolve around the theme of a context for thinking about the future, are the economic outlook for education in the 1980s; the dynamics of the eighties; the future and educational governance: federal, state, and local linkages and the delivery of vocational education; the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act connection; and a spontaneous analysis of the implication of youth employment legislation for vocational education. Provided in the second group of papers are updates for future directions, steps in building a vocational education research and development system, an update of the National Institute of Education evaluation study of vocational education, the plan of action of the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, and a review of pertinent federal legislation. A discussion of the charge and challenge for vocational education concludes the conference papers. (MN)

***********************************************************************
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
* from the original document.
***********************************************************************

ED204595

# 1979 FALL LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE FOR STATE DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

## CHARTING A COURSE OF EXCELLENCE FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE 1980s

Compiled and Edited
by
Mark Newton
Sterling Cox

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

CE 029 332

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark Newton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The material in this publication was funded by the National Vocational Education Professional Development Consortium, Inc. Contributors are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Points of view do not, therefore, necessarily represent positions or policies of the National Vocational Education Professional Development Consortium, Inc.

# PREFACE

"Charting a Course of Excellence for Vocational Education in the 1980's" was the theme of the 1979 Fall Leadership Conference for State Directors of Vocational Education. This year's conference was conducted in Scottsdale, Arizona, September 24-27, 1979, and represented the twelfth annual fall conference for state directors and their key staff.

The 1979 conference theme was most appropriate as we enter a new decade--aspiring to continue the delivery of quality, responsive vocational education throughout the United States and its Trust Territories. Much of the formalized substance which addressed the theme is contained within this document. It embodies the thinking and experience of a broad spectrum of educational and political leaders who are concerned with the complexities of preparing and upgrading the Nation's work force. Their remarks stimulated a great deal of provocative discussion and debate as the conference participants engaged in the task of drafting position statements regarding issues of major concern to the vocational community.

The 1979 Fall Leadership Conference for State Directors of Vocational Education was a cooperative effort. A great deal of assistance was provided to the National Vocational Educaton Professional Development Consortium, Inc. which sponsored the conference. by the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education, the Division of Career and Vocational Education of the Arizona State Department of Education and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education's National Academy.

Special recognition is due to a number of persons who played significant roles which led to the conference's success. Charles Law, former North Carolina state director of vocational education and Frank Santoro, Rhode Island's state director, both of whom, in turn, chaired the conference planning committee, and provided valuable leadership in planning the nature and scope of the conference. The members of the conference planning committee worked long and hard to ensure a quality, focused, in-service activity for state directors. Darrell Parks, director of the National Academy for Vocational Education diligently translated the recommendations of the planning committee into a highly successful conference. Gary Bellrichard, Arizon's state director, Ken Galbert, director of vocational program improvement, and many other fine Arizona state department personnel played important roles in hosting the conference and coordinating its numerous, detailed logistical requirements. Rupert Evans, professor of vocational-technical education at the University of Illinois provided many keen insights in fulfilling his role of conference reactor and synthesizer. Finally, the leadership of Clarence Burdette, West Virginia state director of vocational education and president of the National

Association of State Directors of Vocational Education, contributed significantly to the overall development and conduct of the conference.

The aggregate effect of the work of these people, and many others, facilitated what can be described as an excellent starting point for "charting a course of excellence for vocational education in the 1980's."

James L. Reid, Executive Director
National Association of State Directors
of Vocational Education

# INTRODUCTION

The 1979 Fall Leadership Conference for State Directors of Vocational Education focused on designing a national program plan for vocational education in order to address the significant economic, social, and ideological issues and concerns facing the Nation.

The content and mechanics of the conference were an outgrowth and continuation of earlier efforts of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education (NASDVE). Such efforts have been aimed at designing and implementing an effective and ongoing program of work that will not only exhibit perceptiveness and creativeness on the part of state directors of vocational education, but will also be attuned to other occupational training and preparation for work programs.

The 1979 conference format consisted of a combination of pertinent presentations (contained herein) followed by task force activities which involved the conference participants. The task forces addressed topical areas consistent with four NASDVE standing committees: Funding Alternatives, National Purpose, Role of Vocational Education, and Federal/State Relationships. The task forces were charged with two principal assignments: (1) to analyze what was heard during the presentations and chart appropriate task force action, and (2) to refine or finalize a position statement with respect to the topic and to offer action steps to guide appropriate Association efforts in moving vocational education in a positive and responsive direction.

The draft position statements were submitted to the Association's standing committee on Future Directions for Vocational Education for review, synthesis, appropriate follow-up, and potential adoption as official NASDVE position statements at the 1979 meeting of the American Vocational Association.

The 1979 Fall Leadership Conference for State Directors of Vocational Education was a highlight of my tenure as president of NASDVE. The conference was intense and work-oriented. I was greatly impressed with the commitment and enthusiasm of the participants as they wrestled with the complex problems facing American society today and the relationship of those problems to the delivery of vocational education.

I heartily endorse the acknowledgements expressed by James L. Reid in the Preface to this document. However, I would be remiss by not recognizing the many contributions Dr. Reid has made as executive director of NASDVE. His efforts have enabled the Association to develop into an organization to which state directors are proud to belong

It is hoped that this conference proceedings document will stimulate continued, serious thought and discussion in terms of the future of vocational education in American society. As we chart future directions we must be mindful of our responsibility to work cooperatively to insure excellence.

Clarence E. Burdette, President
National Association of State Directors
of Vocational Education

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . iii

INTRODUCTION . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . V

SECTION ONE: A CONTEXT FOR THINKING ABOUT THE FUTURE . . . . . 1

THE DYNAMICS OF THE EIGHTIES
William H. Miernyk . . . . . . . . . . . . 3

THE FUTURE AND EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE: SOME PROSPECTS AND POSSIBILITIES
Samuel Halperin . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11

FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL LINKAGES: THE DELIVERY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
Wesley Apker . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 21

THE CETA CONNECTION
Janet Rosenberg . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 27

REMARKS OF THE MORNING: A SPONTANEOUS ANALYSIS WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
Rupert Evans . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 35

SECTION TWO: UPDATES FOR FUTURE DIRECTIONS . . . . . . . . . . 39

BUILDING A VOCATIONAL EDUCATION R & D SYSTEM: NEXT STEPS
Robert Taylor . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 41

UPDATE: NIE EVALUATION STUDY
Henry David . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 51

WASHINGTON UPDATE
Dan Dunham . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 57

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE REVIEW
Eugene Bottoms . . . . . . . . . . . . . 67

SECTION THREE: THE CHARGE AND THE CHALLENGE FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 71

THE CHARGE AND THE CHALLENGE FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
Rupert Evans . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 73

APPENDIX . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 81

EXHIBIT A: CONFERENCE AGENDA . . . . . . . . . . . 83

EXHIBIT B: PROGRAM PRESENTERS AND PARTICIPANTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 91

# SECTION ONE:

## A Context for Thinking About the Future

(1) The Dynamics of the Eighties

(2) The Future and Educational Governance: Some Prospects and Possibilities

(3) Federal, State, and Local Linkages in the Delivery of Vocational Education

(4) The CETA Connection

(5) The Remarks of the Morning: A Spontaneous Analysis with Implications for Vocational Education

# THE DYNAMICS OF THE EIGHTIES

by William H. Miernyk*

I would like to state at the outset that the title of this talk is not mine. I would have preferred something more descriptive and less colorful such as the economic outlook for the 1980s, because as my talk develops it should become clear that I am not at all certain that the coming decade will be a dynamic one.

Let me begin with a discussion of the general economic outlook then turn to more specific matters, particularly those of direct interest to vocational educators. Two hypotheses have been advanced by various economists about the coming decade. The first is that the "slack seventies" was a difficult transition period. But the problems we're all familiar with--high unemployment rates, and a disturbingly high rate of inflation, in particular-- will soon be behind us. A few economists feel that the eighties will be a decade of buoyant growth again.

Those who accept this view advance a purely cyclical hypothesis. The sixties as we know was a period of robust growth which created a set of conditions that led to a stagnation in the seventies. They feel, however, that it is time for the cycle to turn upward again. Several economists who have advanced this hypothesis base their projections on econometric models--elaborate, computerized systems of equations which attempt to portray real world conditions mathematically. It's important to point out that these models can't think for themselves. And the cyclical components are built into them by those who write the equations. Thus the optimistic hypothesis of a decade of buoyant growth is based largely on systems of equations which accurately describe the past, but which might be entirely wrong about the future.

The second hypothesis is that the eighties will be a decade of stagnation--or that linguistic abomination which now has the acceptance of usuage, a continuation of "stagflation." Economists who accept this hypothesis believe that the conditions of the latter half of the 1970s will continue throughout the eighties. They feel we will have uncomfortably high levels of unemployment, perhaps hovering around seven percent. Inflation, they argue, will continue to be of the debilitating, double-digit variety.

---

*William H. Miernyk is Director of The Regional Research Institute in Economics, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia.

Those who advance this hypothesis believe, in short, that there will be continued slow erosion in the standard of living for a large segment of the population--for those on fixed incomes, and relatively low income groups. I was quite surprised recently to read that Herman Kahn, perhaps the country's most ebullient and optimistic futurist, is now quite pessimistic about the prospects for the eighties. He does believe, however, that in the far distant future in a century or so things will get better again.

The only other hypothesis that could be advanced is that there will be no change--that conditions will get neither better nor worse. I know of no reputable economist who has made this kind of relatively safe prediction.

## II

Let me turn now to some projections of population, labor force and enrollment trends. These deal with matters that all of you will have to take into account when planning for the coming decade. Let me emphasize, however, that I will be talking about national projections and trends only. Most of the data I will discuss are not available at the state level. And the one thing we can be fairly certain about is that the national changes I am going to describe will not apply to any given state. No two states are alike in economic structure, and there are significant differences in economic conditions among regions and states. This meeting is being held in a state which continues to experience economic growth. Conditions here are vastly different from those to be found in the Northeast, or the Upper Midwest, for example. But while national trends cannot reflect conditions in any state, national trends affect conditions in every state. The national totals are, after all, the sum of state totals. National averages are based on state totals. So I hope that what I have to say, however, general it might be, will still be useful.

First, some general trends: the 1980s could be labeled, from a demographic point of view, as the decade of the middle-aged. The largest increase in population will take place in the twenty-five to fifty-four age group. There will be an increase of almost 7 million males in this age group between 1977 and 1985, but the annual rate of increase of 2.07 percent. There will be an additional increase of 4.6 million between 1985 and 1990, but the growth rate will have slowed to 1.93 percent a year. The number of women will increase by about the same amount between 1977 and 1985, but the annual rate of increase for women will be lower or 1.93 percent per year. Between 1985 and 1990 there will be another 4.7 million women, and the growth rate will have dropped to 1.89 percent per year.

The sixty-five and older group will increase much less between 1977 and 1990. The number of men will go up by 2.3 million while women will increase by another 3.6 million. Also, in general, the component of the population which the Census Bureau classifies as "Black and Other" is expected to grow at a faster rate than whites.

The country's population will grow, and it will grow substantially during the next decade. But what about the age groups you are specifically interested in--the age group which attracts students to vocational schools? Here the picture is entirely different. The number of males in the seventeen to nineteen age group will decline by 1.7 million between 1977 and 1990. Between 1977 and 1985 the decline will be at an annual rate of 2.15 percent. The rate of decline will slow to 1.19 percent during the last five years. But this is partly because annual decreases will be measured from a smaller base each year.

The same general pattern will take place for females age sixteen to nineteen. There will be a drop of 1.7 million in this age group from 1977 to 1990. Again the most rapid--2.11 percent per year--will take place between 1977 and 1985. The rate of decline will drop to 1.23 percent during the last five years of the next decade.

The economic "benefits" of the decline in this age group have been stressed by some economists, particularly labor economists. Essentially, these benefits are related to the high unemployment rates for teenagers that have been with us consistently for the past decade. With fewer teenagers, they argue, these unemployment rates will decline. But that will be true only if the demand for teenagers remains at present or higher levels. This "benefit" therefore might or might not be realized.

For educators, however, it is difficult to see how such projected declines can be considered as good news, especially if they are compared with participation rates in school.

We don't have directly comparable data for the sixteen to nineteen age group. The Bureau of the Census has published figures, however, on the number of eighteen to nineteen year olds in the population in 1970, and the number and percentage of those in school. From this base they have made projections to 1987 for specific years. We are able to compare the first of these projections with actual data for 1974 and 1976. The results are given in Table 1 of the paper.

I won't read this table, but I want to emphasize its most salient features. Notice that in 1970, 46.6 percent of all youngsters of this age group were in school. The Bureau of the Census projected an increase in this participation rate to 52 percent by 1975 and 54.4 percent by 1980, and to 60.5 percent by 1987. But the lower part of Table 1 shows what has actually happened since 1970.

In 1974, the participation rate had dropped to 43.1 percent. And by 1976, it had dropped precipituously to 36 percent. Instead of the 4.3 million youngsters in this age group anticipated to be in school by 1975, only 2.9 million had actually gone on to higher education. It would be completely unrealistic to expect the participation rates that were projected for 1980 and

## Table 1

## POPULATION OF 18-19 YEAR OLDS AND PERCENT IN SCHOOL

| | | Projected | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1975 | | 1980 | | 1987 | |
| | 1970 (actual) | Number | % Change 1970-1975 | Number | % Change 1970-1980 | Number | % Change 1970-1987 |
| Population (millions) | 7,326 | 8,197 | +12% | 8,180 | +12% | 6,668 | -9% |
| In School (millions) | 3,421 | 4,263 | +25 | 4,454 | +30 | 4,041 | +18 |
| % in School | 46.6 | 52.0 | +12 | 54.4 | +17 | 60.5 | +30 |

| | Actual | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1974 | | 1976 | |
| | Number | % of 1975 Projection | Number | % of 1975 Projection |
| Population (millions) | 7,822 | -5% | 8,148 | -1% |
| In School (millions) | 3,375 | -1 | 2,937 | -14 |
| % in School | 43.1 | -8 | 36.0 | -23 |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Commerce Today (February 7, 1972), p. 15, and Current Population Reports, p-20, School Enrollments-Social and Economic Characteristics of Students, October, 1976.

1987 to be realized in light of the past trends. Not only will there be a decline in the number of youngsters in the age group which includes recent high school graduates, but it appears that a declining proportion of them will remain in school beyond high school.

I suspect that colleges and universities are going to be the hardest hit by these demographic changes. We already have serious "surpluses" of some kinds of college graduates--including Ph.D.'s. A "surplus" is defined, in this context, when persons with a given level of education are either unemployed or doing work that would not require the level of education they have achieved.

There could be one bright spot on the vocational education horizon, but let me stress the conditional nature of this suggesiton. When the word gets around that many college graduates are unable to use their training in the world of work perhaps a larger proportion will turn to the trades. One of the great anomalies of our time has been perpetual "disequilibrium" in the labor markets, and let me stress the plural of that last word. Even during periods of high unemployment there are shortages of workers with certain skills. And at times when the unemployment rate falls these shortages are exacerbated. Many of the skills in short supply are those provided by vocational schools. Mechanics and technicians of many kinds are often not available in sufficient numbers to supply the demand in certain areas. I have not seen studies which measure the gap between the numbers of highly skilled tradesmen available and the demand for their services. But a survey of households in any major city, I feel sure, would show that many have difficulty getting repairs and similar services performed by tradesmen. Again, I want to emphasize that I am not making a forecast that there will be a rush of students enrolling in the nation's vocational schools. What I am saying is that the declining enrollments in colleges and universities, and the declining percentages of youngsters in the relevant age group, do not necessarily mean a decline in interest in vocational education. There is even, as I have suggested, the possibility that these conditions themselves will stimulate the demand for more vocational education.

## III

Students will consider turning to vocational training only, of course, if they feel there will be job opportunities once their training programs are completed. And the availability of jobs will depend to some extent on trends in the labor force.

The Department of Labor has recently published labor force projections to 1990 (Monthly Labor Review, December 1977). It might be worthwhile to review the broad outlines briefly. Anyone interested in the specific details will find them in abundance in the issue of the Monthly Labor Review just mentioned.

As usual, the Department of Labor has made three projections: a "high" projection to 1990 of 125.6 million, representing an increase of 29 percent over 1977. Their "medium" projection is to 119.4 million, an increase of 23 percent. And the low projection would be to 113.5 million, or an increase of 17 percent over the 97.4 million in the labor force in 1977.

Since these three labor force projections are based on a single population projection, the differences are the result of widely-varying assumptions about labor force participation. The high projection assumes that participation rates for virtually all components of the labor force--youngsters, middle-aged workers, women, nonwhites--will increase. The only age group for which this projection assumes no increase in its participation rate is that of men and women 65 and over. Their participation rate is assumed to remain constant, probably as a result of the recent change in the forced retirement law.

The intermediate projection assumes that the only male component of the labor force to increase its participation rate would be teenagers. This undoubtedly is a result of the projected decline in the number of male teenagers. They project all other groups to increase their labor force participation rates particularly women whose rate would rise substantially.

The low projection assumes a much slower increase in the participation rate for teenagers, and--surprisingly--a decline in the participation rate for women of child-bearing age, on the assumption that the latter would drop out of the labor force to have more children. The participation rate for other male workers (i.e., except teenagers) would drift downward as would the rates for older workers.

These projections are based on widely differing "scenarios" or projections of the social and economic conditions which Department of Labor economists anticipate during the 1980s. My guess is that the low projection will come closer to the actual number in the labor force in 1990, but not for the reasons given by the Department of Labor economists. I think the demand for labor will increase slowly as the growth of gross national product in money terms remains low. I also think there is a very good chance that there will be a decline in real gross national product per capita during the 1980s. I cannot foresee, on the basis of existing demographic evidence, any possibility of an increase in the birth rate. I doubt that women in child-bearing age groups will leave the labor force to have more babies. Indeed, I project a modest decline in the birth rate which is already low.

The population will, of course, continue to rise. Even with a stable birth rate of 1.7 it would take seventy years for the population to level off, and with a declining birth rate it would take almost that long.

## IV

My views on economic conditions during the 1980s are not those that you will read in such publications as Business Week. This fine magazine has recently published its fiftieth anniversary issue which includes, among other things, an attempt to describe economic conditions over the next fifty years. The authors of the articles making up this issue do see some problems. But on balance their outlook is an optimistic one. The problem with the kind of forecasting reported in this issue of Business Week, and in many other publications which bring economic news to the public, is that the forecasts are based on outmoded economic theories or "models" to use the currently fashionable buzz word.

Most economists, including government economists, are still worrying about how to stimulate demand. They know that the government cannot use the conventional tools of monetary and fiscal policy because this would simply exacerbate inflation. So they fall back on other conventional "solutions". The currently popular one is that what the nation needs is a set of policies that will encourage savings and other policies that will stimulate investment. The reasoning is that this would increase productivity, which has been lagging seriously for the past several years, and at least moderately for the past decade. If these things happen, conventional economic theory tells us, everything would be lovely again. The economic growth rate would increase and we would get back to the condition of the 1960s--the Golden Age in American economic history. But this simplified line of theorizing doesn't take into account that the world has changed enormously since the "Great Depression" of the 'thirties', when these solutions would have worked beautifully.

Why is productivity down? Partly because new health and safety legislation has made it costly to produce raw materials, energy, and to manufacture the goods this nation produces. But a far more important reason which has nothing to do with public policy is the ineluctable law of diminishing returns. It now takes more real resources to produce things than it did in the past. Let me illustrate with a specific example. When oil was abundant in this country it was relatively cheap to produce a barrel. The oil was close to the surface, therefore, it was not necessary to drill deep to hit a gusher. But all that oil is gone. Now we have to do a great deal more exploring and the exploration costs have to be added to the cost of production. And when we find new oil it is frequently off-shore. This means that enormous platforms have to be constructed at great cost and that we have to drill very deep to get the oil. The cost of producing oil in real terms--in manhours, in metal, in machinery, and other equipment, and in time--all have gone up enormously. And this example could be duplicated to some extent in the production of almost everything else. The hard truth is--as more and more economists are coming to realize--that we cannot have perpetual growth in a finite world.

If you look at many growth curves--the growth of the consumption of energy is an excellent example--they are exponential. Any exponential curve has a specific "doubling time". If you know the annual rate of increase it is easy to calculate the doubling time. You simply divide it into seventy. For example, if something is growing at an annual rate of 10 percent a year, it would double in seven years. If it is growing at a rate of 7 percent a year it will double in ten years. This is simply the "compound" interest law familiar to all of us. But there is one aspect of exponential growth which many of us forget. This is that during any period which makes up the doubling time we consume as much as we have consumed in our entire previous history. For example, to be specific again, the United States consumed as much energy in all forms during the 1970s as it did between 1840 and 1970. Before 1840 there had been no growth. About the same amount of energy was consumed year-in and year-out.

But energy is not the only thing we have been consuming at an exponential rate. We are using up many of our resources quite rapidly. Even coal--our most abundant energy resource--is now much more costly to produce. Not only because of safety and environmental laws but because we have to dig deeper, we have to use more expensive equipment, it takes more time and more investment to produce a ton of coal. I could go on and duplicate these examples again and again. But what does it all mean? Is the end of the world at hand? Certainly not.

We will have to learn how to live with slow, and eventually no growth. We will have to become serious about conservation--not just of energy, but of all nonreproducible matter. And we will even have to be much more careful than we have been in the past about the use of resources to produce annual crops.

Efficiency is going to be the name of the game. In many cases this is going to mean a reversal of long-range trends. We have achieved efficiency in the past by regularly substituting capital for labor. In many kinds of economic activities in the future we will have to substitute labor for increasingly expensive capital and energy.

Mankind can go on for a long time, and have a better life than we have enjoyed in the past. But we will have to change attitudes, we will have to change our entire philosophy of work, and to use that badly overworked word we will have to change our "lifestyles".

I would like to conclude by calling attention to a relatively new and I think extremely important work. It is by the late E.F. Schumacher, and the title of this posthumous book is called Good Work (Harper & Row). Schumacher, as he did in his worldwide best seller Small is Beautiful, shows us that the answer to increasing scarcity, and to the continued operation of the law of diminishing returns, is anything but despair. If we accept the facts and learn to live with them life can be pleasant for an even larger population in the future than it has been in the past. In this new book Schumacher offers a workable philosophy and plan of action for a realistically viewed future. It is the kind of thinking more and more policy makers will have to accept in place of the outmoded "wishful thinking" which continues to urge us to try worn out economic policies which applied to an earlier age but which are completely outmoded today.

# THE FUTURE AND EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE: SOME PROSPECTS AND POSSIBILITIES

by Samuel Halperin*

My assignment today is to speculate about the future of our nation over the next twenty years and to help us, together, to consider some of the economic, social, demographic and political changes most likely to shape the governance of education.

I know of no way to talk about the future without touching on some very scary prospects. So I begin by recalling Alfred North Whitehead's dictum: "It is the business of the future to be dangerous."

Let us be clear about the ground rules for our brief time together. My remarks are *not* to be read as predictions. Rather, what I hope we can do together--away from the hurly-burly of our offices and official duties--is to consider together a few of the things we *know* to be true, some of the things which *might* one day prove to be true, and then, combining these two classes of statements, consider some of the *possible implications* of the resulting formulations for the future of American educational governance.

Since our time together is limited, I have chosen to proceed in the following manner. First, I list some of the *major, longterm challenges facing our society* generally, adapted with special reference to education.[1]

1. Organizing, directing, and motivating educational institutions to accommodate to the --
   - massive explosion of new knowledge;
   - revolution in the technology of handling and transmitting knowledge;
   - erosion of all traditional authority structures and decline in respect for "leaders" of all types;
   - decline in most universally shared or central social values.
2. Accommodating ever widening public demands for increased access to education and greater choice (diversity), without rendering the final product ineffectual in quality.
3. Meeting societal demands for technically skilled graduates who are also enlightened, ethical and responsible citizens.
4. Planning educational goals and standards in the face of massive uncertainties regarding --
   - the availability of economic resources and skilled personnel;

---

Samuel Halperin is the Director of the Institute for Educational Leadership, The George Washington University, Washington D.C.

- economic costs, especially the future of inflation and energy's availability and cost;
- society's shifting values and expectations of education
- government's responses to all of the above.

5. Coping with increasing public and media demands for accountability often expressed through cumbersome and prescriptive governmental regulation of educational institutions, processes and products.

6. Adapting to rapid social change generally, with particular vulnerability to coercion and disruption arising from the --

    - spread of violence and access to instruments of terrorism;
    - breakdown of trust and civic responsibility
    - deterioration of all social institutions and leadership
    - sectors on which population formerly depended for security.

7. Creating self-renewal mechanisms for both institutions and individuals particularly for an aging professional workforce in a system with insufficient resources to recruit talented new members to the public sector.

Next, I suggest that we back up a little and deal with pieces of the above listing in somewhat greater depth.

One way we can profitably pursue our futuristic inquiry in education is by turning to demography. That often "dull-as-dust" study is far better appreciated by industry and the military than by educators. In those fields, many a strategic move is mapped only after close study of the census and related population studies.

Before the U.S. House of Representatives (in one of those self-immolating, false "economy" moves which seem so characteristic of declining legislatures) voted to kill its Select Committee on Population, a most useful committee compendium was published--in a grand total of 1,300 copies. On the basis of Domestic Consequences of United States Population Change alone (USGPO, December 1978, 132 pages) we could plan a week of fascinating speculation about the future shape of American society. Here are some highlights of that most useful volume and related sources[2], along with an occasional personal commentary about what I think this might all mean for American society and education.

The United States is likely to continue experiencing large new waves of immigration.

Legal newcomers have recently been averaging four million per decade. But there are signs that immigration from Southeast Asia and the Soviet bloc is jumping sharply in response to political events there. This highlights an important fact: only 7 percent of our legal immigration is from the countries of northern and western Europe the nations which supplied 95 percent of all early Americans and which helped to shape our basic institutions.

When it comes to illegal immigrants, no authority knows what the true magnitutude is, (In fact, all official population projections make no allowance whatsoever for illegals.) Illegals in the U.S. today are variously estimated at between 2 and 12 million persons. We do know that, last year, our Immigration and Naturalization Service apprehended over a million illegals and that three or more got through for every person apprehended. Conventional opinion expects these immigration pressures to mount, rather than subside--particularly if we wish to have neighborly enough relations to be able to purchase Mexican oil and gas....

For education, some implications seem apparent. New immigrants, both legal and illegal, are young. They produce above-average numbers of children. Few have more than a rudimentary knowledge of English, not to mention our culture, history, and values.

If the fertility of American women (deriving from earlier immigrations) remains low, our schools could once again become cauldrons for the forced assimilation of new citizens from other cultures. Or have our political values changed irreversibly since the mass immigration of 1880-1920? As Hispanics--oldtimers and newcomers--become the largest ethnic minority in the nation, pressures for bicultural and bilingual education will likely become even more intense than at present. Instead of assimilation, demands for teachers trained in foreign languages, for enlarged representation on faculties and governing boards, and for culturally sensitive educational materials can all be projected as many parts of the United States become heavily impacted by students and parents with cultures, languages, and expectations markedly different than the ones which have been dominant for the past century.

In short, will "Bilingual Miami" be the wave of the future? Or will ethnic separatism and tension (a la Quebec) mark the educational landscape of the last years of the twentieth century? Will our central city public schools continue to become dumping grounds for poor ethnic and racial minorities while the middle class (of all races) deserts these public schools? Will the new immigrations accelerate the trend toward what the Kerner Commission saw clearly more than a decade ago: the end of the American dream, schools and society stratified by class, race and ethnicity, with the central city public schools for "them" and the private and suburban schools for "us"?

Here are some other demography-driven findings and speculations:

--Despite declining fertility, since 1965 the number of preschool children (under age 6) with mothers in the labor force increased by 65 percent as more women took up paid employment outside the home.

--The number of preschoolers with working mothers will increase substantially because (1) in the 1980's, the number of women in their child-bearing years will be at its peak as the "baby boom" comes of age; if each woman bears 2 children, the number of preschoolers would rise 25 percent by 1990; (2) women will increasingly enter the workforce as our inflationary society requires more income merely to survive.

--If current child care arrangements are projected into the future, the number of children of working mothers served by day care centers and nursery schools would have to increase by two-thirds, to 535,000. Most children, 6.5 million, would still be cared for by relatives or other persons at home; many would continue to receive poor child care with little attention to their developmental and educational needs.

--Will Americans recognize the probable damage to much of our future talent and once again consider what are appropriate public responsibilities for one of the most revolutionary developments in American history: the massive enlistment of women in the workforce?

--Primary school populations are projected to decline until 1985, to increase between 1985 and 1995, and to decline again from 1995 to 2010. The same phenomena will affect high-school and college-age populations five to ten years later.

--These projections and their probable impact on educational staffs and facilities obviously demand attention. Frank Kepper's Aspen Institute studies should be considered by policymakers as they balance the cost of restoring those resources when once again needed for larger enrollments. In any case, state-by-state analyses are the only satisfactory way to treat what is likely, in the national aggregate, to produce severe dislocations.

--America (we know from personal experience) is rapidly aging; the U.S. median age is rising two years every decade (despite the youthful impact of immigration already discussed). As Americans age, our dependent senior population creates enormous new burdens for the relatively smaller working population. In 1900, there were ten youths under age eighteen for every elderly person; by 1977, there were only three youths per person aged 65 and over. During the next decade the number of eighteen year olds will decline by 20 percent. Thus we shall relatively soon experience a marked shortage of young workers. By the mid-1980s, private employers, the armed forces, and the colleges should each be scrambling to attract a larger share of these scarce young people. Ironically, a disporportionately large percentage of tommorrow's young people will be today's neglected minority and under-privileged youth. Thus, the productivity of our industries, the effectiveness of our military, and the preparedness of our college students must necessarily all suffer from the neglect of our young people which we have already permitted. Ominously, too, the viability of our Social Security system, other welfare benefits and pensions "rights" will all be sorely tested by the earnings success, or lack thereof, of today's preteen and teenage populations. In short, the 1990s and 2010s will be a time when the historian may well chronicle: "They reaped as they sowed."

--A brief comment on the relevance of this shortage of young persons for improving the quality of education: with vigorous competition from the private sector for the most talented of tommorrow's young workers, education and the public sector generally will be staffed mostly with the "leftovers." Any chance to improve educational standard must rest primarily with retaining and improving our aging teaching and administrative staffs. Waiting for "fresh blood" to do the job seems statistically and logically unwarranted. It will take extraordinary incentives, not now in existence, to get America's best young talent to enter the field of education in the face of far better offers elsewhere.

--Education as an item of national expenditure did remarkably well in post World War II America. From 2.8 percent of the GNP in 1947, education spending rose to 7.2 percent of the much larger pie in 1967. In the last decade, however, education's share has risen to only 7.9 percent of the GNP.

In the same decade, moreover, educators' personal income has lagged behind every major occupational group except private household workers. In 1967 dollars, today's elementary-secondary teachers earn about what they did in 1968; the real gain in purchasing power of average salaries is under 2 percent. In higher education, real compensation (adjusted for purchasing power) has actually fallen 6.1 percent in the period 1969-78.[3]

Do these numbers from the Proposition 13, Fiscal Fitness Era tell us that education has seen its best days? Perhaps. Again, demography may be partially instructive in considering the question:

--Until 2030 at least, America's post sixty-five population will rise dramatically from only 10.7 percent of the whole in 1976 to as much as 22 percent in 2030. From the viewpoint of public expenditures, this aging population is an expensive one--roughly three times as expensive as per capita public expenditures for youth. Moreover, the expense is not borne proportionately by the different levels of government. Education, we know, is primarily financed by the states and localities while most public spending for the elderly is federally funded. Already, federal funds for the elderly account for a quarter of Washington's total budget. If continued, by 2025, expenditures for senior citizens could amount to 40 percent of a proportionally larger federal spending for education seem obvious, if not incontrovertible.

(Little commentary is needed in this audience about the political clout of senior citizens group vs. that of educators. For my part, I'd rather join 'em than try beating them. The prospects of coalition politics are fascinating, but beyond the scope of my present assignment.)

Much more could be done with educational futures on the basis of demographic data now available to us. But, for change of pace, let me try a more speculative approach with a series of flat assertions about social prospects (again, not predictions) and their possible impact on education.

Let me first state some of the assumptions underlying this discussion of prospects: They are that our society will experience—

- No nuclear holocaust;

- No domestic dictatorship which arises in the name of giving us "vigorous leadership" and "answers" to the increasingly frustrating myriad of problems, domestic and international, besetting the nation;

- No collective failure of "nerve." Despite the enormity of the problems, and the growing tendency of many persons to avoid uncertainty and pain by maximizing self-interest and personal pleasure, I assume the continuing existence of a small, but sufficient number of leaders and followers--"a saving remnant"-- willing to work for less than optimal and immediate self-gratification.

Society's demands for educated workers will increase, most likely beyond anything our planet has ever experienced.

The continuing revolution in telecommunications, computerization and other newer technologies will put a premium on those workers with complex technological knowledge and skills. At the same time, rapidly obsolescent technology means that none of these technical workers and managers will ever be completely competent; training and retraining will be "in" as never before while a sound general "education" on which to base this retraining will be more essential than ever.

"Education will increasingly be defined as learning how to get information; how to work at solving problems; how to re-create, self-renew, and self-direct toward that which never was before. Narrower definitions and arrangements which perpetuate other educational forms and practices will, at the very least, have to make room for this new and insistent demand for "basic literacy."

In this context, computer literary and technological sophistication will become essential, not merely "nice" as home computer terminals, two-way (interactive) phone-video consoles, laser and satellite communications, etc. become economically within the reach of many Americans. Not experiencing some level of competence with computers will one day soon be equated with denial of access to information and, therefore, to equal educational opportunity. (What lovely lawsuits! How much computer literacy is necessary for success in the competitive workplace?)

The drive for total access to education by every group and subgroup in society will not abate. Politicians and courts will continously redefine "equality of access" to stress qualitative aspects: does the access provided result in a consumer-worker who can compete successfully in the economy? This broadening of the concept of access is likely to accelerate public demands for preschool education and child development (to provide a receptive base for preschool education and to liberate working women) and for continuing adult education, especially for technological training and retraining.

In a new emphasis on learning (as contrasted with schooling), the public and our politicians will demand more coordinated (or at least cooperative) relations among schools, colleges, libraries, museums, community services, social and civic organizations, etc. Public demands will increase to meet the total learning needs of all members of society, not merely those formally enrolled in schools. There will be accelerated drives for "community learning networks", "integration of home-school workplace and recreation", etc. Educators who resist these demands will have tougher times garnering scarce resources and/or will be swept aside altogether.

Concurrent with certain strong centralizing tendencies in society (e.g. TV, central computer banks, instantaneous video communication) which will precipitate massive battles over who controls these systems and the software that goes into them, there will be renewed, and effective, demands for decentralization. Neo-democracy and neo-humanism will increasingly maintain that (1) larger systems of all types, especially large government and large schooling, have failed, and (2) only greater trust and incentiveness at the grassroots level bear any prospect of addressing our numerous problems. Individual schools and teachers will demand--and get--more autonomy. Parents, teachers and citizens without children in the schools will all be involved with contentious forms of participation and "public accountability". Indeed, the lines between participation and governance will increasingly blur. Without such local variations in participation (new forms of social/political "legitimization"), there is scant prospect that professional educators will be allowed to ply their trade and even current levels of public resources for schooling will not be forthcoming.

Since knowledge will continue to grow exponentially[4]--and new technologies will demand greater individualization and specialization, adults will have less information in common than even before. Effective communications on substantive lines, even within the same discipline (e.g., physics, literature, sociology) will become almost impossible.

Therefore, if society is to survive peacefully, our definition of education must be expanded to stress a kind of civic morality or "social glue" that is now lacking. Unless ways are found to bind Americans together (indeed, with all members of planet Earth), the prospects for division and dangerous social conflict--fostered by the amazing success of technology and knowledge explosion--are certain. In short, we need to rethink "civic education", "education for public service", etc.

Education's financial ability to afford the above changes is problematic. As education's traditional student body diminishes in number, and as the politically more powerful demands of the aging mount (national health insurance, old-age assistance and welfare reform)--along with other high social priorities (energy R&D, crime control, rebuilding our archaic cities and disintegrating transportation systems, etc.)--will education's share of the GNP be politically able to keep pace? Not without a thorough restructuring of education's tattered alliances and a radicalization of the teaching profession.

Leadership of all types, including education leadership, will be under greater stress than ever. Public frustration with the rapid pace of social and technological change, the lack of ready solutions to hitherto unconfronted problems, the competition for limited resources among a large number of "good causes," new threats to our standard of living and to cherished institutional arrangements, etc., will all combine to make the lives of our leaders "living hells".

At the same time, leaders will be more essential than ever. Without such leaders, we shall have no prospect of holding our society together and of working at the problems that can end human life on this planet. We shall sorely need them to try to discern trends and to serve the emerging new central facts of our society. More than ever, we shall need persons willing to act on what they perceive, even though they are wise enough to see contradictions even though they recognize the limits of knowledge and even of rationality itself, even though they know the melancholy prospect that nothing might work, that everything might fail...

In this connection, I believe our society will have to give greater attention than our democratic tradition has hitherto permitted to the training and nurturance of leaders. With less apology and self-consciousness, we need to invest one percent or so of our resources in systematic efforts to enable our leaders and their support staffs to be more successful than if left to their own devices. While I would not (today, at least) advocate a "West Point for Educational Leaders", I do believe that society must make much more than fragmentary and random efforts if it is to have any fair prospect of maximizing its enormous investments in public education.

The nation needs to restore--and to be serious about--training programs like the Education Professions Development Act, which recognized that competence can be developed as well as inherited. We need to experiment judiciously with the business schools' case method of preparing decisionmakers to act. We need far more than the 200 advanced clinical placements each year which are made possible to be less self-conscious in our approach to problems of leadership. Just as the need for specialized traning for military and naval leadership is widely accepted, we need to work toward a national climate in which training for the public service, including education, is viewed as vital to the survival of a free society.

## NOTES

1. Adapted liberally from Morton Darrow's January 30, 1979, remarks at the Educational Staff Seminar of the Institute for Educational Leadership. Darrow is Vice President for Planning and Analysis, Prudential Insurance Company of America.

2. I am particularly indebted to the unpublished statements of Arthur J. Lewis of the University of Florida, Robert Theobold of Wickenburg, Arizona, Patricia Graham, former director of the NIE, with whom I testified in "foresight" hearings before the House of Representatives' Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Committee on Education and Labor, April 1979.

3. See Report on the Annual Survey of Faculty Compensation, 1977-78, AAUP Bulletin, September 1978; Scheduled Teacher Salaries-1978-79, Seclected AFT Locals, March 1979; Estimates of School Statistics, 1978-79, NEA Research Memo, January 1979.

4. Dr. Graham's testimony, April 26, 1979, cites these examples of incredible change in the preceding century: travel speed increased by a factor of 100; control of infectious disease improved by a factor 1,000; data handling speed increased by 10,000; the speed of communications increased by a factor of 10 million.

# FEDERAL STATE LOCAL LINKAGES:
# THE DELIVERY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

By Wesley Apker*

I must tell you at the beginning of this speech that it has been a difficult one to prepare. It has been difficult because I want to be practical without being mundane; I want to stimulate without offending; and I want to challenge without angering.

I don't think that I have to tell you that vocational education is under attack. If our response to that attack is to circle the wagons to fend off our attackers without some longer strategic plan, we may win the skirmish, but lose the war. Let me bore you for a few moments with where I think we are.

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 was created by a coalition of businessmen, farming interests, labor leaders, social reformers and educators. Vocational education was designed, funded and administered as a system apart from academic education. It focused on a narrow range of specialized trades--agriculture, trade and industry and home economics. It was designed to provide job entry skills to the nonacademically inclined, partly to provide manpower to America's growing industries and partly to prevent the emergence of a class system. As designed the system made sense and was responsive to the needs of an expanding and increasingly industrialized America. It continued to make sense until the late forties.

While Congress has made some changes in the law, most recently set asides for categories of students to be served, the system created by the original law remains remarkably unchanged. Vocational education is under attack today because society has changed, employment needs have changed, the populations to be served are broader, and the service delivery systems competing for similar clients are more abundant.

Through the late 1800s and into the early 1900s, how one lived, how one worked and how one learned to work was most often learned in the context of the family unit. Apprenticeship and production took place on the farm, in small cottage industries and in the skilled crafts. But as America became more industrialized and more urbanized and the factory became the focus of production, training for productive work became increasingly separate. In creating the vocational education system in 1917, business and industry said to the schools "you provide the skill training, the general education and the socializing." And in the beginning it worked--it worked because considerably less than 50 percent of our teenage population went to high school; those who came, came with a purpose and with the force of the family behind them; they came in the main for a general education; and socialization was a shared responsibility with the home. Those who went through the skill training programs went most often directly from school to jobs related to their training. A growing industrial nation not yet technically sophisticated needed these young people and their job entry skills.

---

*Wesley Apker is Executive Director of The National Association for State Boards of Education.

But today, on the threshold of the eighties, the form and function of work has changed fundamentally; our technology is sophisticated and changing; our society has changed demographically, and over the next fifteen to twenty-five years will change even more dramatically; and the finiteness of our tillable lands, our water, minerals and petroleum resources are daily dawning realities. And our educational system, including vocational education--we are utilizing essentially the same system, the same methods, and offering essentially the same courses as fifty years ago.

The process of entering the job market has changed dramatically and employer staffing practices have also changed dramatically. From a variety of research studies over the past ten years we know the following:

1. People make career choices that rather closely reflect career opportunities.

2. Most people do not make career choices during the secondary school years.

3. Individual career choices generally emerge after a period of search and exploration among several different jobs and postsecondary school programs.

4. The actual decision to enter a specific career occurs about six to eight years after high school.

5. Employers cream from the available employment pools, individuals who will not need a great deal of immediate training and who are likely to stay.

6. Employers staff the better, more skilled or more senior positions/jobs from within their organizations.

7. Employers utilize either increased schooling requirements as a screening device or utilize screening devices which are designed to screen out "low risk" workers.

8. When employers look to fill adult jobs, attitude and job experience are more important than skill preparation.

9. The minorities, black and hispanic, the poor, both urban and rural, women and the handicapped have been underserved by vocational education

and are uniformly employed on the aggregate in low skill, low pay jobs.

10. Vocational education and employers continue to steer women into sex stereotyped positions.

11. Occupational and career counseling, job placement services and job placement follow-up studies are almost totally nonexistent in the typical comprehensive high school.

12. While national surveys and job projections are needed, so are local job market projections since most noncollege students get their first full time job in their own local community.

Over the past ten years we have also learned some valuable lessons from the various occupational education and training delivery systems:

1. from manpower programs that short-term, low budget programs do not yield lasting results

2. from CETA, that the disadvantaged can be successfully enrolled

3. from both, that programs too narrowly targeted to special groups create motivational and role model problems

4. from proprietary schools, that new training markets can be responded to quickly and thereby develop excellent relationships with the needing employer groups

5. from apprenticeship programs, that classroom and specific job skill training with pay yields a highly motivated, employable and promotable individual

6. from industry, that many jobs require on-the-job, site based training, but that a number of jobs, including med tech and clerical jobs are best prepared for on a school site.

7. from the entire occupational education and training system, that despite substantial federal and affirmative action efforts, the forces perpetuating segregations by race, sex and class, persist.

Well, I've thrown at you a number of data bits gleaned from twenty-five or thirty studies, all conducted within the past ten years. Let me summarize what I think the major conclusions are, and then I'll move directly into what I think must be done.

1. The labor market has changed, the way we enter the labor market has changed, and the career ladders open to individuals have changed.

2. For job entry, specific job skill training is far less useable than skill training for occupational clusters common to several industries.

3. Lack of skill in reading, writing, computation, communications, basic reasoning and people relating, doom an individual to unemployment or at best, permanent low skill, low pay, dead end jobs.

4. Bridge jobs and postsecondary training; coordinated high school work-experience programs; apprenticeships, or skill training as closely related to job placement as possible; and realistic orientation to career ladders, the world of work, and local and national career trends, are all programs that will pay off, both in school-to-work and youth-to-adult transition and long term wage and job security.

5. Adult career changes due to techonological and economic changes will require better retraining and skill upgrading opportunities.

6. Much greater compensatory education and skill training must be focused on the minority, the poor, and the handicapped.

7. Much greater effort must be exhibited to eliminate and counteract tracking and sex stereotyping.

8. Industry and some educators, in the belief that if some skill training is good, a whole lot more would be better, require community college degrees or licenses as minimums for job entry; rather than having any long-term benefit, this practice screens out the poor, the handicapped and minorities.

From all of this data I can draw only one conclusion, we must make significant changes in our vocational education delivery system.

- Vocational education must be redesigned so that all students, including the college bound understand how career ladders can be accessed, what industry looks for in employees, how technology is changing the work force, the relationship between bridge, transition and primary jobs, and the relationship of resource availability, investment capital, economics and employment opportunities. This will require a new kind of teacher, skilled vocational counselors, access to local and national job trend data, a knowledge of and a placement in bridge jobs which best lead one into desirable career ladders.

- Vocational education must make absolutely certain that their students can read, write, compute, communicate, reason and relate to people. At the secondary school level such courses should be taught in the context of hands on learning--engine operation, machine operation, secretarial skill training , construction technology, drafting, and the like or in the context of experiences flowing out of a part time job.

- Vocational education at the secondary school level, except in those areas where classroom training is both more efficient and effective than is on-job-site training, should back away from specific skill training and focus on transferable occupational cluster skill training which is carefully targeted to entry positions tied to attractive adult ladders.

- Vocational education should greatly expand coordinated work study programs so that students gain first hand job site experience, develop career awareness, and have an easier transition from schooling to work.

- Vocational education must provide compensatory training for minority, poor and handicapped students to help them compete for higher skill and primary jobs.

- Vocational education absolutely must stop steering young girls and young women into stereotypic sex roles and jobs.

- With the increased regulation of proprietary schools, greater recognition of the value of their programs for certain skill training must be accepted.

- Because occupational and vocational training, particularly for minorities, the poor and the handicapped, may require the interface and cooperation of general education, vocational education and manpower training, such students should have their educational and skill training needs assessed and diagnosed, should receive an employability development plan, and all their learning, training, and job placement over a three or four year period should be in strict compliance with the development plan.

- State vocational education directors must stop treating the five year plan as a compliance document, and use it for what it was designed to be, a planning document. Should you continue to fail to do so, Congress will become more and more prescriptive, and more and more suspicious of your willingness to redesign vocational education to fit today's society.

- Home economics must be dropped from vocational education; it is a general living course, not a vocational preparation course. Agricultural education must be greatly deemphasized. Between 1960 and 1970 agricultural jobs decreased by 2 million; in absolute terms, vocational agriculture enrollments increased by 50,000 during that same period of time.

- Vocational education must not be offered solely at the school site, between the hours of 8:00 and 3:15, and from September to May. Working students and adults seeking skill updating need access when it fits their working schedule (shift work is increasing in America, not decreasing).

Well, I suspect I have given you more than enough to have lunch over. Now I want to remind you that nowhere did I say that vocational education was no longer needed or that it should be deemphasized. What I did say was that our world and our society have changed fundamentally; that entry into the world of work has changed fundamentally, and that the nature of work itself has changed fundamentally--but vocational education has changed very little.

There are many in Washington, D.C. who are saying in all sincerity that federal secondary school vocational education funding should be terminated, and those funds given to the postsecondary community, made available to proprietary schools, and to more focused CETA type programs. I have been invited to some of those meetings, and the people saying it are not antieducation, antipublic school, or antivocational education. They are bright, thoughtful people who are results and pay off oriented. They are people who have looked at the available data, and drawn conclusions. Their conclusions are that it may no longer be worth the investment.

To be sure, vocational education has many supporters, but that support is one hell of a lot thinner than anyone in this room likes to talk about. Clearly we can't roll over and play dead, but let me say as forcefully as I can, if we circle the wagons and defend the status quo, then we are falling on our own swords of narrow, self serving, self interest.

I have attempted to suggest for you an action agenda. To accomplish it some aspects of the federal law must be changed. At the state level, you must work far more proactively, utilizing good data, based upon systematic planning, involving much, much more the state board and the state advisory committee. You are your state's vocational director--you above all must acknowledge how outmoded your delivery system is when compared to today's and tomorrow's market place realities. You must be in the forefront of designing a bold new vocational education agenda for your state. Will it make you popular with your local school district colleagues? Probably not, but leaders are not paid to be popular; leaders are paid to lead.

# THE CETA CONNECTION

by Janet R. Rosenberg*

## Youth Employment Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA)

We must recognize that YEDPA has (despite its numerous pieces) an array of programs which fill all gaps in the CETA delivery system. We need to link the pieces together better—the pieces are there.

The Department of Labor now has responsibility for a great deal of money spent in schools for educational purposes. YEDPA money spent in schools equals three fifths of the federal contribution for vocational education. Education people have been most cooperative despite the fact that labor has moved in on many traditional education areas.

The research aspect of YEDPA has never been equalled in history. Discretionary dollars under this act are five times the discretionary dollars in the war on poverty, when adjusted for cost of living increases.

While there are many possible alternatives the following legislative or administrative actions are likely in the future:

1. Better employability planning extended over multi-year duration
2. New standard of measurement for youth programs
3. Extended CETA involvement in school-to-work transition
4. Merger of CETA work experience with cooperative education programming.
5. Decision on continued CETA involvement in alternative education
6. New structures for sorting out kids into the programs which will do the most good
7. Decision that the CETA delivery system is the principal vehicle for conduct of federal dollars for youth
8. Increased emphasis on training
9. Decision on the extension or expansion of YEDPA

---

* Janet R. Rosenberg is Special Assistant to the Administrator, Office of Youth Programs, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. Contained herein are the highlights of her presentation.

## WHERE ARE WE?

Cumulatively, over the past two years, over four billion dollars has been spent on youth employment programs. In 1978, nearly half a million youth were served in all six programs administered by the Department of Labor, and over $7 million was spent on education-related activities. Of this money, over 80 percent went to economically disadvantaged enrollees, and we can reasonably assume that the monies targeted to minorities and the disadvantaged populations are having a positive effect.

The past two years have seen an unprecedented number of interagency agreements among the federal agencies involved. In addition, new non-profit intermediaries are proving useful in providing services to this population. The findings of NCEP indicate that there have been substantial qualitative improvements, and the coordination between CETA and LEA's has been better than expected.

Partly as a result of the Vice President's Task Force, we are gathering more sophisticated data and statistics on clients. Over $480 million has been spent on Hispanic youth over this two-year period, with 55,000 Hispanic youth served during fiscal year 1978 alone. In the same fiscal year 190,000 blacks (excluding those in SYEP programs) were served with over $1.8 billion expended through six programs. So I think we have an admirable track record.

## FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In 1978, the Office of Youth Programs implemented many more projects to test ways to serve disadvantaged youth. Specific groups such as criminal offenders, runaway youth, handicapped individuals, and single parents (especially teenage mothers) were the targets of several programs. More emphasis was placed on transactional analysis approaches, learning labs, and training institutes as methods of reaching people who have not, traditionally, responded well to standard classroom training methods.

Various funding approaches were also tried. These approaches included service mixes, mixed income funding, different sponsors (with several programs under joint sponsorship) and consolidated grants. More emphasis was placed on private sector funding (PIC-TJTC) and on management improvements to make the most of the available government funds. Another round of exemplary in-school program grants for the handicapped and high-risk-youth proposals are due at the end of June. Our aim is to have a federal youth employment policy for the 1980s in place before we carry on the work of these additional studies.

## CONSOLIDATED YOUTH EMPLOYMENT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

Several demonstration programs are planned. These involved ten sites-one per region - and lump YCCIP, YETP, and SYEP programs into one concerted effort. In order to get maximum local involvement, certain federal regulations had to be waived. This allows much more flexibility in the determination of programming. Common eligibility requirements are (1) 85 percent funding by LLISL; (2) participant age requirements of fourteen to twenty-one years of age.

The programs are built around the central notion of building an employability plan and employment record for each participant. This individualized approach is carried over year to year to assure that each participant receives maximum job/employability counseling. The continuity of services in all areas is stressed. A new round of competitive grants on the special population involved-high risk and handicapped - will be awarded on the basis of applications received on or before June 25.

## VICE PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE ON YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Many of you have been hearing about the Task Force, and there are high expectations both in the government and (I'm sure) in the vocational education community on the outcomes we can expect. From the Department of Labor's point of view, the Task Force has been charged with four major functions:

- The public relations function - to highlight and promote the activities that have been going on and the gains that have been made
- Interagency coordination and sharing of information/ideas through White House meetings, site visits, conferences with key planners, and policy review processes
- Building political consensus, or at least attempting to do this, through promoting greater tie-ins between federal and non-federal agencies, unions, private business, chief elected officials, etc.
- Creating a proposal that brings together CETA, vocational education, cooperative education, career education, and various programs for special populations.

This last point may prove to be our greatest challenge, but we expect it to be achieved through what could turn out to be a lengthy and involved process of defining the appropriate issues and reviewing existing policy. This should all lead to a rather innovative proposal.

Now, how do we expect to achieve all this? In addition to field reports from selected governors and mayors, we have planned six major conferences for the coming year on the following topics:

1. Job Corps (April 6 and 7)
2. Work and education
3. Non-profit organizations and their role in CETA
4. Special needs populations
5. Special problems of inner city youth
6. Unions and the private sector

## PRINCIPLES AND POLICY DIRECTIONS

Various policy directions have evolved through the concerted efforts of the Vice President's Task Force and nineteen federal agencies. In addition, 150 outside organizations such as private businesses, unions, education groups, community-based organizations and public interest groups all provided valuable input. In making policy decisions, information from demonstrations, research, and evaluations plays a very important role. However, I can't overstress the importance of old fashioned common sense as the basis of all policy decisions.

As we consider these factors, however, we cannot escape the funding issues. All the federal agencies serving youth, including DOL and HEW, want more funds. The Office of Management and Budgets, however, wants to hold the line, and the people at OMB approve foward funding or advanced appropriations. What do we do when we know we are only one segment of the federal effort requesting our share of a somewhat diminished funding base? We know our chances of receiving new funding through legislation in 1980 are about one in five. In addition, we are competing with energy, inflation, and recession factors well known I'm sure, to all of us. We can be sure DOL and HEW will each want more than half. What we can reasonably expect, remains to be seen, and no one yet knows how the new Department of Education will fit into all this, but it is sure to be a factor in any funding decisions that are made.

The only solutions we have for the dismal funding situation involve stretching the federal dollars to get the most out of the money available. This means making adjustments, but it also means holding firm on certain principles. The following is a brief list of some of the points that have been considered and on which some kind of agreement across agencies has been reached

- Youth programs could be consolidated in some areas without loss of quality. (There is some question of lumping in SYEP at this point.)

- The youth and young adult programs should be split from each other. (We must keep in mind that a fourteen-year-old is not just a small twenty-one-year-old.)

- Youth needs are developmental. Different strategies must be developed for young people fourteen and fifteen years old than for those sixteen through nineteen, etc.

- Youth programs should be judged on input measures (quality of supervision, etc.) rather than impact measures.

- Certification systems need to be developed. These systems must be based on locally-developed competency standards and must take into account pre-employment experience, employability, competency in basic skills, and vocational competence.

- Increased emphasis needs to be placed on performance requirements both for individuals and for programs as a whole.

- We need ways to provide an "aging vat" for our young people who do not yet have the maturity required for many types of employment and pre-employment experiences. We must recognize that intensive remediation doesn't pay off for youth under eighteen or nineteen years of age. We need to think of better ways to cluster vocational exposure.

- Incentive funding - matching funds with strings attached - will chart the course. Those involved in such funding programs will include the private sector (allowed 100 percent subsidy of certain programs) vocational education, special needs programs, and certain community-based organizations.

## YOUTH CAREER OPPORTUNITIES ACT (YCOA)

The following is a brief outline of the various titles involved in the Youth Opportunities Act and the main points of their particular sphere of activity:

Title I -- Local Career Preparation Programs

1. Consolidated local programs
   - a. Local formula-funded operations with maximum flexibility
   - b. Career development records
   - c. Investment agreements
   - d. Career development benchmarks
   - e. Citizens Review Council
2. Federal incentives
   - a. LEAs
   - b. CBOs
   - c. Special needs
   - d. Private sector
   - e. Employment Service

38

3. Equal chance provision
    a. Increased resources for pockets of poverty
    b. Career development account entitlement

Title II -- Federal Career Entry Initiatives

1. Job Corps
2. Career ladder apprenticeships
3. Interagency job access programs involving
    a. conservation
    b. weatherization
    c. transportation
    d. social services management and delivery
    e. regulatory agency compliance
4. Large-scale, long-term federal projects for multistaged work and training experiences

Title III -- Infrastructure Development and Linkage

1. State and regional support
2. CBOs
3. Private sponsor development
4. Prime sponsor development
5. Knowledge development and dissemination

Title IV --Youth Opportunities Commission

1. Independent review body
2. Administration of citizens' reviews
3. Recommendations for interagency programs and large-scale projects
4. Recommendations for federal incentives

Title V -- Transition Provisions

1. Current programs continued through 1981
2. Increased funding in YETP
3. Eliminate maintainance of effort
4. YACC to Agriculture and Interior departments

Half of the participants in this program come from CETA, and there is discretionary money available for the transition period until the provisions of the act can be put into place. Target date for complete implementation is 1983. The foundation on which the act rests is the Youth Opportunities Commission, but it will take an ever greater interagency effort and large scale planning on the part of all involved parties to make the provisions of the act work for the benefit of our disadvantaged youth.

## CONCLUSION

As we face the challenges of the 1980s we must all bear in mind that the ultimate goal is to better the quality of life for those who have traditionally been left behind. By providing programs that will help these people better their own lives we will be helping to make possible a greater society for all of us.

# REMARKS OF THE MORNING: A SPONTANEOUS ANALYSIS WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by Rupert Evans*

There is an adage in legislative circles that the program that gets to the Congress last is likely to get the least. Let me remind you that the youth employment legislation is likely to hit the Hill ahead of the reauthorization for vocational education, so this is something I think we all have to be concerned about. Janet has pointed out some very, very interesting things including a movement toward carving up the service to youth and adults among federal agencies. Career education is expected to take on responsibilities for the younger years, and vocational education and CETA are expected to collaborate on programs for disadvantaged youth in the sixteen to eighteen year range. Somebody else (we don't exactly know who, but probably the private sector plus CETA) is expected to take on responsibility for older people. I think this is absolute nonsense. Each of us has some things we can do well, and the necessity of working together is upon us. But the way to do it is not to say , "We're going to serve people up to age so-and-so, you're going to serve people up to age so-and-so, and somebody else is going to take them over at the end of that age range." This is no way to work; but this is something we have to face up to, and it's going to require enormous efforts to compromise. You folks, of course, are going to be at the heart of it.

We have coming up, also, the concept of mandated individualized employability plans. These have enormous potential if they can be implemented. They are likely to be tied in with certification standards in which a stamp is put on an individual saying "You now have the basic education that you need for employability." A little later, another stamp will be added, "You now have the basic work attitudes that you need," and a little bit later on, "You now have the basic work attitudes that you need," and still later on, "You now have the skills that are needed for employment." Just how we're going to put these stamps on people and what we're going to do with the stamps that we know are placed on the wrong people at the wrong time, we don't know. No one knows quite how we're going to work it out, but it's going to be interesting.

I hope you noted that figure Janet gave you about the 22 percent of YEPDA funds mandated by law actually working out to more than twice that much as CETA and local education agencies in many places have begun to work together. And she's right about the 100 percent in a few places. In other places, the figure is 75 percent. What we don't really know yet (but it's extremely important to us to find out) is that there appears to have been an enormous turnover of local vocational directors in large and medium-sized cities along with enormous turnover at the state level. One of the major factors

---

* Rupert Evans is Professor of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Illinois

41

I see (at the local level at any rate) is that vocational directors who were not getting along well with CETA were replaced. CETA, perhaps has had more effect on vocational education administration than any other single factor.

Bill Miernyk gave us some very important information. Please note, however, that when we are talking about a shortage of young workers, we're probably talking solely about a shortage of young white workers. We're certainly talking about a relative surplus of "black and other" -- that's the way they categorize nonwhites -- black and other young workers. And the potential for conflict among youth that will arise out of this relative shortage on one hand and relative surplus on the other hand will have to be taken into account.

One of the problems with trends is that one trend can conceal another. Bill Miernyk gave us something I don't think is going to soak in for several months, but think about it -- the trend toward lower and lower enrollment in the secondary schools. The popular press and most education administrators are blaming all of that change on the decreases in birth rates eighteen or so years ago. The fact of the matter is that it is a compound of two things -- it results from a decrease in birth rate and also from a decreased rate of school attendance. The dropout rate in the secondary schools in this country flattened out more than a decade ago. The completion rate was about 75 percent until two years ago, and then the completion rate started to go down. The figures that he gave you were for eighteen to nineteen year olds. We do not have good figures for secondary school youth, but we do have some scattered figures indicating that in California, according to one report, the secondary school dropout rate tripled in the last three years. In every state with good records on this, the dropout rate is increasing. It seems to be increasing most rapidly in those schools where they scare kids to death by telling them they have to pass an examination before they get a high school diploma. The kids say, "All right. If that's going to happen to me, there's no sense in the school forcing another failure on me, so I'm going to quit before it happens."

Bill's figures show that in 1970, we had 47 percent of the eighteen and nineteen year olds in school. Six years later, in 1976, we had 36 percent of them in school. This was during a period of time when we were expanding our opportunities in postsecondary education, but the proportion of kids in school has gone down. Don't make the mistake of assuming that this is being caused just by the decline in birth rate. It just happens that we have two things hitting us simultaneously. We're going to have some similar problems of conflicting trends in another area in the next few years. Some people say we may not have a shortage of young white workers because we're going to have more and more females entering the labor force. Now, I happen not to believe the forecast. We have had, for many years, a decline in the proportion of males in the labor force. It's below 80 percent now for adult males, a decrease of almost 10 percent in the last twenty years.

We have had, obviously, a very sharp increase in the proportion of females entering the labor force. Now, over half of the adult women work for pay. And incidently, I don't like the term "work force," because I think women have been working all along. But, if we're talking about the labor force, that's employment, and more than half of the adult women are now in the labor force. Some of these people who look only at trends expect that the male labor force participation rate and the female labor force participation rate will cross. I don't believe it. If I'm right, there will be a combination of a shortage of young white youth and the approach of a static proportion of women in the labor force. If so, we will end up with an extreme shortage of workers unless we continue exporting jobs. So the phrase, "The re-industrialization of America" (which I wish we had said more about when we were talking at dinner last night), is something that we need to be thinking about.

There's a bitter story going around in bilingual circles. A Hispanic says to his son, "We've made real progress -- your grandfather was a 'wetback,' I was an 'illegal alien,' and you're an 'undocumented worker.'" This is part of an enormous change that is upon us. Maybe the industrialization of Mexico will take off part of this pressure, but as Sam could have said (but didn't), it's not just that we have Spanish-speaking immigrants, we have Yemenis, we have Greeks, we have people from all over the world -- and we need them. The taxi driver in Washington, D.C., is more likely to be from Nigeria than from any other ethnic group. This cultural pluralism we have not yet recognized in vocational education is something we must take into account.

In connection with vocational education I hope you'll think about the task force groups. A lot of people talk about improving the quality of work. Surely teaching our students how to improve the quality of work ought to be one of the major tasks of vocational education. This means not just accepting work as it is, but finding out how to make it better. As a correlary to this, one of our major problems in vocational education today is that we have a very bad situation with regard to the quality of work for vocational teachers, industrial arts teachers, and mathematics teachers. One of the reasons we now have shortages of some types of teachers is that these folks can get better employment outside of education. We have to be especially concerned about the quality of work for our administrators and for our teachers in vocational education, but if the quality of work in any part of education suffers, we all suffer. One of the ways we will suffer is that we again have a shortage of teachers in all fields.

Finally, if we're talking about a role in vocational education for the middle-aged and the elderly, don't overlook entrepreneurship training. One of our major problems in this country is that we do not have efficient organizations for handling many of our services. There are two types of entrepreneurs. There are craft-type entrepreneurs and opportunistic entrepreneurs. Craft-type entrepreneurs are willing to take a crack at anything and will employ somebody else who has the skills. Vocational education has a real role to play in developing both types of entrepreneurs, so it bothers me when I talk to vocational educators and I continually hear them saying, "we are preparing employees." Well, surely we're preparing employees, but we also ought to be preparing entrepreneurs. The group that is the most logical candidate for this training is the middle-aged who already have the skills and now can organize them to sell.

# SECTION TWO:
## Updates for Future Directions

(1) Building a Vocational Education R&D System: Next Steps
(2) Update on the NIE Evaluation Study
(3) Washington Update
(4) Federal Legislative Review

# BUILDING A VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
# R & D SYSTEM: NEXT STEPS

### by Robert E. Taylor*

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to talk with you about building a nationwide vocational education R & D network. I would like to address some of the more critical issues that are affecting the leadership in vocational education.

First, I would like to report on your National Center and then talk about some next steps in a nationwide program improvement or R & D system. I deliberately used the term nationwide rather than national, because by nationwide, I want to imply not a centrally dominated, funded, tightly-linked system, but rather a cooperative or loosely linked system based on mutual benefits and reciprocal actions. That is what I think we have emerging, and as a result of my comments, I hope you will have a better appreciation of some of the steps in progress.

As you know, the charge to the National Center was twofold--first, to attack problems of national significance, and second, to help build a nationwide program improvement capacity working with the RCUs, curriculum centers, and others to create this national linkage network. The 1976 Amendments specified several functions for your Center--that of applied R & D, evaluation, information for program and policies, leadership development, a national clearinghouse, and dissemination and utilization. In our proposal, we tried to aggregate these in terms of a substantive focus around more responsive vocational education and under the responsive paradigm four major themes--two relating to organizational development and renewal (namely, comprehensive planning and evaluation) and the other two targeted on sex fairness and populations with special needs. As part of the first function, within the next two or three weeks we will be mailing to you some thirty-six publications and products that grew out of our first-year effort. We have just passed the midpoint of our second year. There was a considerable time lapse between the time the Amendments were passed and the time the National Center actually received funding, but we have for your use the thirty-six products that have grown out of the first year effort.

One of the points that I would like to make is that through the National Academy through the dissemination and utilization activity of the National Center, we stand ready to provide technical assistance, training, leadership development, or whatever would be necessary to secure more effective utilization and application of these products. Some of them relate to things like academic credit for work experience, alternative outcome measures for vocational education, increasing the participation of women in administrative roles, guidelines and procedures for insuring environments for the handicapped, barriers to articulated state and local planning, curriculum guidelines for entrepreneurship programs for postsecondary institutions and so on.

---

* Robert E. Taylor is Executive Director of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Another mainstream effort that will be continuing over a period of several years relates to that of the performance-based teacher education modules. Here, we will be adding additional modules on nondiscriminatory practices and special procedures, competencies, and skills needed to supplement and more directly serve populations with special needs. Our goals are to mainstream and assimilate those particular groups more effectively and to help develop the unique skills that may be needed to work with them in specialized situations.

I'd like to tell you briefly where we are with the performance-based teacher education modules. There are 100 modules dealing with the professional skills needed by vocational teachers. They are now being used in 310 American universities, all Canadian provinces, and fifteen foreign countries by such companies as United Airlines, Eastman Kodak, Continental Baking, IBM and four government departments. They are soon to be translated into several foreign languages and will be distributed through the United Kingdom and Australia as well. So there is some evidence that vocational R & D is having an impact and is making a difference.

During the coming year we expect to be emphasizing certain activities in this area like comprehensive local planning, which seems to be quite consistent with the emphasis of our speakers yesterday. We will also be emphasizing placement and follow-through with particular emphasis on the domain of follow-through.

Under the information for planning and policy function we have been doing such things as providing suggestions to the Office of Education for research, curriculum and personnel development priorities. I would like to reinforce the comment Rupert made yesterday--that if our studies are valid and if your state plan projections are reasonably close to what is going to happen, we do face strong potential personnel shortage in vocational education, and not just at the teacher level, but in some of the leadership areas as well.

We will be conducting, during this coming year, a conference on alternative futures for vocational education. We are developing what we call specifications for longitudinal studies in vocational education. We have had an impact, and we hope to continue to have a significant impact, on such national studies as the class of 1985. We hope to have available for your use, for those of you who can find and undertake them, specifications that would be useful in longer term studies and follow up of vocational graduates. Our funds at the National Center do not permit this; and given the investment of NCS and others in this area, it did not seem prudent to undertake such studies. Some of you may want to, for those who do, the information will be available.

Additionally, we produced the 1976-77 annual status report on vocational education. I'll just mention that vocational education served 17 million people at a federal cost of $33.07 per individual served. We will be working in the area of energy implications for vocational education as that may relate to the infusion that Dan talked about yesterday in terms of energy implications for all occupations as well as what might be new occupations growing out of the energy program in development.

In the area of evaluation, we have produced handbooks on follow up for regular students as well as populations with special needs. We have commissioned, and have available, a white paper on evaluation of vocational education that was done by the Educational Commission of the States. It looks at all the various diverse and sometimes redundant ways in which vocational education is being evaluated. We have worked with ten states on their evaluation studies and reports and we have underway such projects as a study on the correlates of placement. We are working with Henry David and one of his contractors on a study of the effects of vocational education as it relates to recent and non-national data based studies. On the table there will be special information request forms for your use. We trust you will share with us any recent studies dealing with the effects of vocational education that can be considered in this summary and synthesis.

The other study that we are undertaking is one on state leadership. I might say we are undertaking this by dropping our effort on research and curriculum priorities. With the appropriation levels being what they are for programs of national significance, it didn't seem sensible to develop priorities for money that wasn't there to spend. In our study on state leadership we are focusing on such questions as turnover, administrative structure relationships, and kinds and qualifications of personnel hired. We are trying to develop some projections of the competencies and skills that will be needed by state staff personnel in the future when we think about economic development, energy, and some of the other things that are likely to be a part of the state leadership role. I discussed this study with Gene Bottoms, Dan Dunham, Ray Parrott, Jim Reid, and other members of this group. We welcome any suggestions that you may have that will help us identify some of the critical questions that need to be answered in this area.

A number of the speakers yesterday talked about the importance of leadership development and what you might also call educational statemanship with respect to vocational education. Again, I would like to remind this group that the Advanced Study Center, a part of your National Center, provides opportunities for fulltime post-doctoral study for periods of nine to twelve months. The support base for study is equal to the person's last year's salary up to a maximum of $32,000. We are trying to attract some of the best minds in the country to look at the critical, fundamental problems and issues in vocational education, to generate intellectual capital, to look at a broad range of alternatives, and to create data bases and a set of alternatives that will be increasingly useful as we think about the vocational education programs for the '80s and the '90s. In the past, we have had a broad range of participants coming from a variety of backgrounds--past state directors, personnel from a governor's staff, manpower planning people, professors of psychology, and a sociologist demographer who has some very interesting and positive kinds of information to share through a study he did using census data to examine the effects of vocational training. You as directors are in a critical position to nominate personnel and to support them. Try to help individuals understand that there is going to be a place for them when they come back at the end of nine or twelve-month study period. We desperately need your support in nominating the kind of people who ought to be studying these crucial problems and who we hope would be better qualified by these studies to assume increasingly responsible and influential roles in the broad vocational education work areas.

The other leadership dimension is that of the Natonal Academy which I think is emerging as the vocational education training arm. During the past year we conducted some twelve workshops in as many states involving some 815 people. We had participation from all fifty states and four territories, and next year we have thirty-six such workshops planned.

Another dimension that may not be as well known about the Academy program is that of the resident program. During the past year, sixty-one people, largely state staff personnel, came to the National Center for an average of four weeks (the range was one week to six months) for intensive study, to work with members of our staff, to use our library and information resources, to prepare state policy statements, and to help refine or perfect state models and procedures. Some of the work that has been done by personnel here has been adopted by state boards as major policy statements. Here is another leadership development option that is available to you.

Let me say again that through the D & U system I'll comment on in a few minutes, we have an increasing capacity to deliver technical assistance around some of the new products and developments that are growing out of the R & D enterprise. I think you are going to be excited about some of the developments in this area.

Now another function that is applied to the National Center is that of the clearinghouse. One of the functions there has been to develop a tracking system to control bibliographic information on some 1285 federal and 6700 state administered research, innovative and exemplary programs from 1970 through 1977. The clearinghouse is also developing a tracking system that will provide information for researchers and program administrators to help them identify relevant research that is underway so that they can build upon--not duplicate--research efforts. This tracking system is now beginning to pick up on funded research within thirty days. So now, when you are undertaking R & D or program improvement activities, you have the ability to know immediately what is already underway in other states before you make a decision, allocate resources, and make an investment commitment in this area. Further, federal and state policy makers can analyze the investments--they can tell what kinds of problems are being attacked by what kinds of dollars--so administrators can hold researchers and program administrators accountable for outputs. The tracking system is well underway. We have good input from all states but two, and we expect by January of next year to be able to begin analysis on some of the program improvement investments.

With respect to the dissemination and utilization system, which is another responsibility, we have been working with the RCUs, the curriculum coordination centers, and others to develop a network to disseminate the best available products. There are literally millions of dollars being invested by you and other states, as well as by the commissioner and others, on everything from curriculum, to research, to policy studies, to guidelines etc. One of our responsibilities in working with members of your staff on technical panels and in other activities has been to screen these various products and try to select those that have the greatest potential for solving problems relating to some of the critical priorities like sex equity, special needs populations, evaluation, planning, and other critical areas.

Let me share with you some of the facts about the system that have occurred since January of 1979. We had a national meeting at the National Center in this area represented, I think, by some forty-two states. Dan Dunham and Gene Lehrmann were there giving it a very strong endorsement and push. For example, 62,000 copies of the resource update on sex equity have been distributed. We have screened 3,700 products to identify six that are most relevant, applicable, and of the highest quality. Presentations have been made at state and national meetings. We have conducted two nationwide conferences and have a third planned. We have written fourteen articles in this area, and our program information office at the National Center has responded to 1,700 requests on these products.

We have begun already to think about the next set of products for this year. Let me just tell you a bit about these products. One is a handbook for teachers of adult occupational education developed in the state of New York. Approximately 3,200 copies have already been used. Four states have incorporated it into their state teacher certification program and it is being used in two industrial settings. Through CETA programs twenty-four LEAs and forty-five postsecondary institutions are using it. We are getting data and we are getting these excellent products used. Another of our products relates to guidelines for sex materials in vocational education. Six thousand copies are out in twenty-two postsecondary institutions. The Texas State Department printed 1,900 copies and distributed 500 in the State of Texas alone. We've had statewide dissemination by state education agencies in seventeen states. In other words, we have in place the mechanisms, the products, the tools to make a real difference in some of these critical areas. Another step forward is the product developed by Florida on mainstreaming handicapped students in classrooms, management evaluation placement systems, architectural considerations for barrier-free environments, and so on. A number of complimentary copies were distributed for use in university education courses, and several state agencies have adopted and used this series. Of the guidance and suport services for physically disabled from TERC (Technical Education Research Center), 200 copies have been distributed and, forty other states have expressed interest. Similar materials on expanding career horizons were developed in Illinois; thirteen workshops have been conducted in various states for the use of these materials. Cost benefit procedures for postsecondary programs were developed in Indiana; eighteen different states have begun to use this material.

I think we are beginning to compile some convincing evidence on several points. One is that there are good, useful, technically competent, relevent, generalizable, R & D products that we ought to be making more use of. We have systems for identifying them, and we are gradually strengthening our systems for getting them out and getting them used. State directors, RCU personnel, and disseminators have a key role in this.

At next month's D & U conference at the National Center (in early October) we will be introducing six more of the products we have screened out during the last six months. I reviewed these products and I think they are a real testimony to the quality of program improvement efforts on the way across the nation. Only one of these happens to be a National Center product. I hope you will recognize that these nationally selected products can supplement your own state improvement efforts. Again I'd like to emphasize that they have been selected on the basis of relevance to problems, technical excellence, and usefulness. This selection has been done with the help and assistance of personnel from the states. Each quarter now we are sending you descriptions of other products we have uncovered that we hope you will consider. We simply lack the resources to back these products with the level of dissemination efforts we expend on these six.

We have invited the RCU personnel and staff from the curriculum coordinator centers to our conference. Some of the curriculum centers are sending their state liaison representatives. We hope you are supporting the conference, because it's going to be important to program improvement nationally and, we believe, to your own states. We will be sharing with them the six, best, newly available products. Also, the developers of these products will be in attendance. Your staff will be able to talk in depth with the people who developed these products, ask them questions, and get assurances about the product's utility and relevance to your state and situation. So, again, I hope you and your state will be represented at this meeting.

Another effort we have is that of providing training for RCU personnel and the curriculum center staff. We conducted four program improvement sessions during the RCU conference here in this building earlier this year. We have developed resource and research management materials for the RCU and guidebooks on contracting. We also made major presentations and conducted training activities at the national curriculum network conferences.

Through our interactions with the RCU personnel we have become increasingly aware of the need to introduce more cooperation and coordination across the various research activities that are going on in the states. For example the agricultural experiment stations have tech panels composed of representatives of states working in common areas. Growing out of a planning meeting with the executive committee of the RCUs, was a plan to attack some of the major problems as youth employment, the education-work connection, validating vocational education effectiveness, and assuring its relevance and accessibility to states. Our concern here is to find states interested in working on these particular problems within their own states, using their own state resources. The National Center would provide help, counsel, and hopefully some coordination. The resulting studies would be additive and cumulative, and some of the definitions would be similar. Yet these independent state studies would be more influential and have greater impact in terms of regional and national policy. At the same time, by virtue of the concurrent interaction and planning that would be going on, these independent state studies would in themselves, be more rigorous, useful, and beneficial to the states.

Greg Morrison of South Carolina, the RCU president, is writing to all of the RCUs to gauge their interest. I've prepared a letter describing this in greater detail for you. Individual copies are on the table in the next room. We hope that you will discuss this with your RCU director when you get home. Regardless of the outcome, we do hope to convene groups of research and development personnel who are working on common problems. In these groups we will share information and try to be constructively critical of each other's approach and methodology with the hope that more rigorous and useful studies will result. Hopefully, by virture of some similar definitions and approaches, we can get better cumulative data to impact on national policy issues.

Let me talk about another concern that we have. I don't know how it looks from your perspective, and I hope that you will have an opportunity to discuss it among yourselves and share any individual views that you have with members of your executive board. We plan to continue our liaison with the state directors of vocational education. Jack Struck, who was president of the state directors the year we met in Oklahoma, appointed a liaison committee for the National Center. We were a group of some eight people who met two or three times a year. Then, during the past year, we mutually agreed that probably the best approach would be to have the executive board of your association serve as the official liaison committee to the National Center. We hope to be able to meet with that group at the Center at least twice a year in order to exchange information, to communicate on problems to benefit from your perspective, and get feedback on ways that our program and activities can be more effective and useful.

Our concern is how we can best communicate with state departments. Should we always try to direct all of our communications to the state directors? Should we try to channel most of the information on R & D products and activities to the RCU director? Should there be something like a liaison person identified by the director, to whom we would attempt to direct most of the communications on R & D products, activities, academy training efforts, other options, and situations that evolve? Would it be more useful to have someone on your staff who might also be labeled a "Center Watcher," someone who would be expected to know most of the things that are going on at the National Center, who could call to your attention a research project that parallels a problem, an Academy training effort that some staff member ought to attend, a product that will be useful for an inservice workshop at the state university next summer? How can we best set up effective communication? I think now we are sending different messages to different people, and no one person in the state, to the best of my knowledge, has a total picture of all that is going on. We would like to ask you to think about that and write me directly or talk to members of the staff who are here from the National Center. It is an issue that we are going to discuss with the executive board at our next meeting, and we will be inviting you (probably by mail) to designate someone. You may want to designate yourself. Our concern is setting up an effective channel so that, hopefully someone who has the bigger picture of activities at the National Center can be an active resource to you. This person could call your attention to National Center activities that might be useful in your programs.

I have reported in the main on activities carried out under the National Center contract. However we have other activities funded by the National Institute for Education and other groups. We are working actively on vocational education in corrections. We're undertaking research on adult career development and on transferrable and generalizable skills. (I might add, that is a very hot topic in Europe right now.) We are working with three international labor unions on apprenticeship training. We were pleased to have the Federal Committee on Apprenticeship meet at the National Center about a month ago concurrent with the National Advisory Council. With the number of things that are going on, I hope you will think about this concept of a "Center Watcher" or someone who could make a more deliberate effort to keep informed on the range of activities and who could serve as a consultant with respect to these.

There are other publications and activities also coming out--state of the art papers, for example--on guidance programs for women, individual educational employability plans for vocational education and the handicapped, local planning, and coordinating vocational education and CETA. These are the things that will be mailed directly to you within the next few weeks. Let me say again that, based on our experience it is going to take technical assistance training programs--seminars and workshops--to get these better R & D products used, to acquaint those who are going to use them or who are going to teach those who will be using them. We are willing to work with you on that, and we await your interest and concern in that particular area.

In addition to the things we are contracted to do, our National Center switchboard is now handling 800 to 900 calls a day. Last year we had over 15,000 information requests, about 3,000 of which we were funded to handle, but we responded to all of them. We had 1,900 visitors to the National Center last year from every state and about fifty foreign countries. We have nineteen advisory panels, with 146 members from thirty-three states. We used over 700 individual consultants from forty-three states and eighty-three different types of institutions and agencies. We now have an 800 number--you may want to write it down--800-848-4815. And we have a program information officer, Judy Cohen. Unless you have a question about a specific project and a specific individual--that is, if you have general questions she will do her best to get an answer for you or put you in touch with the appropriate person at the National Center who is working in your problem area.

One of our contracted obligations is that of assessing the impact of program improvement in vocational education. We're doing this with respect to the National Center itself, but we are also responsible for assessing program improvement in general. These assessments will provide better data for the Congress, for policy makers, and for others on whether or not vocational education R & D is making a difference--and I submit to you that there are concrete examples to show that it is making a difference. We are beginning to form the linkages, the points of interface, to accelerate the output and use it effectively and in a far broader way. I'm speaking of the output not only of the National Center but of the fine program improvement investments that you are making in your states. This nationwide linkage network, based in large measure on reciprocal benefits, is going to hinge around the kind of support, the kind of endorsement, and the kind of resources that you allocate to it at the state level in terms of getting these excellent products out beyond the state level to local schools, community colleges, and others. We're anxious to continue to work with you and help in identifying needs and priorities. We are willing to provide assistance in coordinating and sharing information. We think activities like the tracking system will be increasingly useful in terms of investment. (In other words, it would not seem prudent to invest $100,000 in a research and curriculum project without first determining whether that same thing is already underway in two or three places throughout the country.) We think the products that are being identified with your assistance as worthy of being nationally disseminated are going to have increasing use.

Also, out on the table you will find a set of green sheets containing what we are calling, for the time being, core questions. It is awfully difficult, if not impossible to get survey instruments approved through OMB and all the other processes that are now involved. Increasingly, vocational education is being asked to come up with better and more powerful data with respect to the effects and consequences. We hope you will look at these core questions and tell us whether you think they are, in fact, the kinds of questions that need to be answered to satisfy ourselves, to be useful with respect to program improvement evaluation, and also to help portray vocational education adequately and accurately to the policy makers. Please give us your feedback on these questions. The hope is that over time various state officials, various doctoral students, and others might pick up on some of these questions and replicate them. These questions then can be aggregated and used across a broader range of geography than in individual states. Please look at these questions and discuss them with your executive board. Mark them up--add questions that you think need to be included and delete those that you think are inappropriate.

We urgently need the support of this group on appropriations for programs of national significance. We have been at a static level for two years in a row. You know that we were successful in getting the House up to $13 million, but we lost $3 million in the final conference committee. Activities like the National Center, NOICC, SOICC, curriculum coordination centers, graduate leadership programs, and commissioners' discretionary funds are tied up in that. We hope you will take that into account as we try to fine-tune our legislative and appropriations strategy.

In closing, let me mention some of the other topical areas that we're going to be looking at during the coming year. These include areas such as vocational education and productivity, comprehensive planning, apprenticeship, energy, follow-through, CETA linkages, and so on. We are anxious to continue to work with this group. We do not claim to be perfect. I suspect that we have problems, and we hope that you will share those with us and members of your board so that we can be more effective and useful as your

National Center. I believe during the coming year these linkages and the informal nationwide system will be strengthened. As our coordinating efforts become more effective we can build programs and policies around the output of our sound investments in research and development. We have in place the elements of the nationwide program improvement capacity; it can and is making a difference. Thank you very much for your cooperation in helping us get this far.

# UPDATE: NIE EVALUATION STUDY

by Henry David*

For those of you who may not be entirely familiar with it, let me remind you that this is a congressionally mandated study under the Education Amendments of 1976. It is described in the text of the law as a thorough evaluation and study of vocational education and related programs--namely those under CETA and under the 1202 commissions, But that description is slightly misleading. It is not a conventional program evaluation of vocational education or of its programmatic dimension. It is, if it is to be properly understood, a policy inquiry, and what is being evaluated is, in a strict sense, the capacity of the Congress to write exclusive vocational education policy legislation. The questions raised in our inquiry, therefore, represent not necessarily the most important dimensions of vocational education, but sets of issues which are important to the Congress as it contemplates the task of rewriting the legislation beginning after oversight hearings are held in 1981.

We will also be doing a number of things which represent in a more conventional sense program evaluation, because we will, in connection with consumer and homemaking education programs, try to get a sense of what they are about, what difference they make, what effects they have on participants. We will be devoting part of our resources (as you will recall Bob Taylor having said) to ascertaining the extent to which it can be done--and I'm not optimistic about the extent--to measure the effects that can be attributed to participating in vocational education programs of various kinds by various kinds of learners. So we will be trying to make sense both of the national longitudinal survey data through analysis and reanalysis and of the methodologically sound evaluative studies which do not use national longitudinal data.

We stand now roughly at what could be called the third phase of the study. Preparative work for the study began after the technical amendments of June, 1977. Staffing for the study got underway in the spring and early summer of that year. I came aboard as director in September of 1977, and we worked very hard during the remainder of that year to fulfill one critical requirement--namely, the submission of a plan for the study to the Congress for review and approval before the end of the calendar year. That plan was submitted on December 30, 1977. We tried to develop the plan with as much help as we could secure from the vocational education community. A number of people in this room served on technical committees or on a consultant group, and gave us very powerful assistance.

---

* Henry David is the Director of the National Institute of Education's Vocational Education Study.

The next phase of the study is one I remember with a sense of dreariness and almost repulsion. It was one in which we went about the business of procuring research through the RFP route. This statement reveals my own personal bias. We then moved to select performers and make the first significant set of awards of contracts in the fall of last year. Since then we have made three additional awards. So, we now have six contracts in the field and an equivalent number of staff (intramural) studies planned and underway.

Let me remind you of some of these. You will recall that the statute which directed the studies said that we should pay attention to four things which loomed large in the minds of the Congress: (1) the funds for vocational education--federal, state and local--and what happened to them; (2) issues of compliance, not only with the vocational education laws but also with other applicable laws of the United States and the elements of intersection among those laws, notably civil rights legislation and vocational education legislation and coordination with CETA; (3) the means for evaluating program quality and effectiveness and the consequences that presumably would flow from the new set of evaluative requirements in the legislation; and (4) the content and effectiveness of consumer and homemaking programs. These are the four things which loomed large in the mind of Congress, and they loom large in the design of the study. We would be grossly off target if we were not highly responsive to what the Congress wants to learn about. But these four concerns do not delimit our inquiries, and there are additional items.

Our major contract, both in size and critical nature, perhaps, is the one awarded to the University of California at Berkeley, the School of Education. This study looks at the distribution of funds. Next in importance of size and also in significance is the study that combines the inquiry into compliance and evaluative practices at the state and local level. This contract was awarded to ABT Associates, Inc. Third is the study that considers the responsiveness of the states and localities to Congressional intentions with regard to consumer and homemaking education, a study awarded to Contract Research Corporation, Belmont, Massachusetts. Those were the first three contracts awarded, and they have been described to you, I think, on several occasions. I prefer not to devote a good deal of time to them.

The three more recent contracts awarded are not of lesser significance, but they are smaller in scale. One deals with special needs populations. The contractor is A.L. Nellum and Associates, located in Washington, D.C. Next, a contract on the effects of participating in vocational education programs was awarded to The Huron Institute, Cambridge, Massachusetts. There are two significant parts to the Huron Study. One part is performed by the National Center (as Bob Taylor mentioned earlier today.) This part looks at the smaller institutional, state-wide, localized evaluative studies and tries to get a handle on what difference participating in vocational education programs of different kinds means to learners, both in economic and noneconomic terms. The other part is a look at the studies made using the longitudinal data to determine the economic and noneconomic effects of particiapting in vocational education programs and also the use of such data for reanalysis purposes. We also thought we would see whether the longitudinal survey data could be used to construct an artificial file of vocational education participants. The reason for that is that the numbers identifiable as vocational education students turn out to be small, poorly described, and ambiguous. So, if such a file could be created we would have a larger data base to manipulate.

Finally, there is a study being performed by the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law that looks at the legal framework for vocational education at the federal level including the regulations, and then extends that look to the comparable state legislation and regulations in four states. These are all in operation, and I will, in a moment, indicate where they stand with respect to availability in the field.

Those of you who have heard me speak before will recall my saying that we have very limited resources for the conduct of the study. Because of this, we have not been able to conduct national surveys. Instead, we used inquiries in a total of twenty-nine states, relying very heavily on case studies, and used off-the-shelf materials for national analyses representing the vocational education enterprise.

As you know, in order to go into the field and ask more than nine individuals similar sets of questions, you have to run an obstacle course. The obstacle course is both nongovernmental and governmental. There is a committee of the Council of Chief State School Officers,(CCSSO,) whose blessings must be secured. Then there is this surrogate for OMB clearance known as FEDAC (Federal Educational Data Acquisition Council). All the instruments used in the study have to be presented to FEDAC and approved before they can be used. Thus far we have been successful in securing the necessary clearances in spite of the problems arising from other data collection efforts. The most important of these are the VEDS and the OCR surveys. The negative views taken toward both of these, which are, of course, leaglly sanctioned studies with penalities for failure to participate, carries over its effect to our study, which is voluntary. I would be remiss if I failed at this point to repeat my warm appreciation, and that also of the Institute, for the cooperative spirit exhibited by the states, by the state directors in particular, and by their willingness to take on the additional burden of being responsive to the demands of the vocational education study. We have had nothing but positive responses to appeals for cooperation and assistance.

Let me say a quick word about what we are trying to do intramurally. These efforts are focused on topics not fully covered in our extramural, contract studies. One is a study on which you have already given assistance to Dick Carlson, who, as you know, has been detailed from BOAE to my staff. That is a study of vocational education for the incarcerated. Dick tells me that he is already deeply indebted to the state directors, and I know that he has asked for additional help which I believe will be forthcoming. We have also had assistance on his study from NACVE, which has made it possible to conduct some hearings on that dimension of federal legislation and its consequences.

We have an ambitious study on vocational education in the rural and sparsely settled areas. NIE transferred money to this project so that we could extend our research. We have just begun a look at the basic skills of vocational education students. In effect, this is an attempt to understand the nonoccupational dimensions of vocational education, and I regret to report that the literature in that domain is impoverished. The issue of basic skills is central to current national policy concerns.

I hope you'll entertain a moment of personal recollection. I'm not a vocational educator, but I knew a great deal about vocational education a little over twenty-five years ago, because I was responsible for a study entitled, A Policy for Skilled Manpower, the first of its kind. That was an easy study to do because of the scale of the enterprise at that time. All of the issues which were furiously debated then and all of the domains of ignorance which frustrated sound policy thinking still remain. We do not know with precision through what routes people come to be trained; we can first measure the scale of the investment in the acquisition of occupational skills, and we are uncertain about the effects of vocational education. At a succession of regional meetings conducted in the early '50s with employers in all parts of the country, there was one common refrain: young people were completing school without the basic skills employers needed. They complained that young people came to them well-informed and able to write, compute, and read; but they came without any specific skills, according to some employers. Others said they appreciated the fact that the schools were preparing them adequately for entry-level jobs, which was what they expected. In other words, employers were saying twenty-five years ago all of the contradictory things they are saying today. And the question remains, "to what employer shall I pay what kind of attention when he or she speaks of what the schools are doing or failing to do?" Basic skills are central to all future learning and all future work performance, as well as to other functions. The basic skills capabilities of vocational education students is consequently an important subject.

What else are we trying to do? We are trying to get a handle on the problems associated with compliance in a variety of federal grant and aid programs. Grant and aid programs in many cases represent macropolicy intentions fulfillable at the microlevel through what states and localities do. That set of relationships--sometimes ambiguous, sometimes permissive, sometimes with sanctions, sometimes with sanctions that cannot be invoked because they're too punitive--establishes difficulties in understanding the very nature of what compliance is as well as understanding the period of time within which compliance can be realized. I should add that we frequently forget that time is a critical resource in policy implementation.

Well, I need not go on to recite further where we stand and what we're doing, because I've brought with me probably an inadequate number of copies of our current status report. They're here. I invite you to take a copy. I invite you to ask for additional copies. It will tell you where we stand. The status report describes the central elements of the study plan and it tells you where we've departed from it (which we had to do, simply as a function of being intelligent. The best plan is the one which you can write after you finish something.) It also tells you what we will be reporting. Incidentially, I hope you'll take advantage of the fact that two people from two major studies--Gary Hoachlander, University of California, from whom a number of you have already heard and have met, and a new project director from the ABT study, Vernon Lee Beuke, to whom I hope you will talk--will be able to tell you more fully about when the studies will be in the field.

I want you to bear in mind, as some of you may have heard me say before, that these several pieces of inquiries, both contracted and intramural, are part of a larger design. All will be utilized together with a body of concurrent research being done elsewhere and funded by others, to write first an interim report which will be submitted by September 30, 1980, and subsequently, a final report by September 30, 1981. I want you to think of all this material as being cannibalized, digested, and interpreted for those reports. I would mislead you if I suggested that we know how the reports are going to be structured. They will have to be structured in terms of central ideas that will be shaped in part by a changing set of circumstances and conditions.

There is great preoccupation now with youth unemployment. It will probably persist. But the central issues affecting vocational education are not likely to turn on that issue alone. If that were so, policy might be written for the short-term and not for the long-term. It may well be that the modifications in legislation now contemplated to which Gene Bottoms referred will never come into being because of political and budget considerations. I, myself, am pessimistic about any significant changes in new legislation. I am more optimistic about rearrangement of resource availabilities. But that may not change any.

I said that we will be in twenty-nine states in one fashion or another. These are specified in the status report. The present picture of field operations looks as follows: The University of California's pilot study has already been mailed out to ten states. Eight have said they are willing to play--some with modifications. The forms are due back the following month. We'll know as a result of that pretest whether we will be able to go forward with what was originally contemplated--namely, a survey covering 1600 institutions one-fourth of which would be postsecondary. Some of you who served on the advisory board for that study know in detail what kind of problems attend that kind of institutional survey.

The field schedule for the ABT study looks as follows: Between October 15 and 26, it will be in Indiana, Wisconsin, and New York, and then subsequently in Illinois. The plan is to be in the field in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Oregon in November. Then in December it will be in Colorado and Oklahoma. The others will be covered in subesquent months. The field work for all fifteen states in the ABT study should be completed by late March or early April of 1980.

# WASHINGTON UPDATE

By Daniel B. Dunham*

A little over a year ago we started on a plan of action in the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education. The plan is still in the process of becoming a real plan and has reached the point of at least being put on paper. I will share this with you later on this afternoon. However, I do want you to know that when I made a commitment at Otter Crest a year ago, we moved into a planning process. Although it does not precisely mirror or parallel what we are asked by federal law to do, I feel it is only appropriate that the Bureau which is charged with administering the law for the federal system, enter into a planning process which would give you as state directors and other persons involved in this enterprise some sense of our direction, some sense of priority, and perhaps some sense of more specific kinds of things than we have been able, in the past, to share with you.

I must tell you that, without your continuing support, your guidance, your criticism, your arguments with us (and happily, in most cases, the positive resolution of those arguments) this plan would not be what it is. Nor would it have happened or been complete without fine staff. This staff, often criticized for carrying out its functions (and sometimes justifiably so, I am sure) is limited in number, with some very new people still learning, some old hands who have learned as well as from the new people, and new leadership. Some of the new leaders are here today. I hope you will all get acquainted with them because from the administrative point of view they, along with Dr. Martin and others, will have major roles in shaping the new legislation. Now, I would be remiss if I didn't mention that one of our staff members is also here-Dick Carlson who has been with NIE for several months and will be with them until late Spring. Without the strong and able support of people like these and many others we would not have been able to come this far with respect to the sense of direction for the Bureau. This, I think, has not often enough been part of your consciousness. We want to share it with you.

You remember that a year ago, we began with eight priorities. We have reduced the agenda to three priority initiatives, partly because (1) you told us we might be over-extending, and (2) many of you responded to the notice in the Federal Register a few months ago which asked for your input. This is all in the paper which you will receive later. I will not spend a lot of time on it except to say that these three initiatives are: (1) education and work, which is a broadened title or concept from the CETA/vocational education connection we began with a year ago: (2) urban and rural programs, a continuation from the original eight priorities; and (3) expansion of education opportunities for adults. I think, after all you heard this morning about demographics, about what I called "mothballing" schools and bringing them back into full use in ten to fifteen years as adults reenter the educational system; about adult basic education; and adult vocational education, we must have a new vision and new priority in this area. (These are not in priority order as were the original eight because we feel they are equally important at this level.)

---

* Dan Dunham is Deputy Commissioner of Education, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

We have identified seven supporting elements (we call them supporting priorities) and have established a few new level-two priorities which are beginning to be new issues for us to deal with. Interestingly enough, some of these were touched on by your very able speakers this morning. They are not in priority order, but are new issues, new ventures for us. We do not attempt to be all things to all people in Washington with respect to education, but we try to offer a place to anchor some new issues, or perhaps some old issues which have never found a programmatic or administrative home. These include older Americans, correctional education, minority institutions, secondary school reform, and one that two of your speakers touched on this morning which is perhaps the most exciting outside of the system enterprise I have been in touch with for a long time, international programs of vocational and adult education.

We have moved to a planning system that will give you some sense and perhaps some appropriate signals of what we think ought to be the broadest possible priorities. They have been included in an operational plan with individualized performance plans to support it. This plan will allow us to increase productivitiy, effectiveness, and perhaps more importantly, the efficacy of the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education.

Much of the rest of what I have to say to you is based, in large measure, on the survey most of you responded to conducted by Monty Multanen. It identifies some issues you wanted brought before this conference. I have taken the liberty of creaming (if you will) some of these issues--those that seem to come up most often. I will try to cover about five topics, leaving to this afternoon's discussion more clarity and, perhaps with the support of the other staff members here, more accurate and specific answers than I can give you in this brief time today.

I have about four or five things, the first being technical and policy issues. You have heard from Lee about putting into place the rules and regulations to guide the implementation of Public Law 96.46. This had to do with the overmatching capacity that States will have with disadvantaged and handicapped set asides.

The second issue on the agenda is VEDS. It has become a new, four-letter dirty word to many people. I am amazed the chief state school officers have taken the position they have, in terms of lack of foresight, not in terms of specific arguments. We have been able to move to a two-digit fiscal approach. I think you are aware of that. The policy memorandum is in the final process and should be out to you as soon as we have had our opportunity to look at the final version as we promised you we would do each time. It should give you some new directions on how to deal with that issue.

I have a brief paper on the issues of the chief state school officers' position and on the most recent modifications proposed by NCES to be made to the present system. It includes some special attention to the postsecondary community, which has been a rather contentious issue. By taking a moderate and negotiating approach, particularly through the good offices of Kent Bennion, our key person from the Bureau's point of view, we have come to some useful compromises with which all of us can live with respect to the technical development of this system. I will review this paper with you, as you may wish, later this afternoon.

The third issue is memoranda. We try not to overdo this, but we must also try to respond to your inquiries for greater clarity and for more complete understanding of the law and regulations. These often result in policy memos. Sometimes they result in program memos, which do not have the clout, authority, or responsibility of policy, but have more of a clarifying function. You will receive three new memos shortly. Two of them are already in the mail, but I doubt that any of you received them before you left for this conference. One will clarify cooperative work experience, yet again. It is a very critical memo. The second memorandum has to do with budgets. There will be a new policy memorandum on three year plans. You have heard about this; it is Memo #79.15. We will be able to answer more specific questions this afternoon.

The most important enterprise dealing with policy has to do with a new manual for federal funding distribution. This will be the subject, among others, of the October training conferences for state leadership staff. These conferences will be conducted around the country by the division of state vocational program operations. You have already heard from Lee about one aspect of that. There are eight other recent policy memorandums which we will refresh your memory on later.

In the state plan approval process, as some of you know through phone calls from our staff this past week, we have been able to solve the problem of the vacant Commissioner of Education position even though the law absolutely requires the exclusive signature of the Commissioner of Education before final approval can be secured. We have not circumvented the process; we have found a new way through the counsel and advice of our legal people to sign your grant awards with the concurrence of the Executive Deputy Commissioner, Dr. John Ellis.

As of today, nine state plans for vocational education have been fully approved and grant awards have been issued. Twenty-three more state plans will be fully approved by the end of this week. You have as much impact on the status of approval of your state plan as the Bureau's approval process through your response to requests by our office for modifications. Once those are in, we will attempt to turn them around very quickly and move them through the letter-of-credit process. If you look at the profile of dates of approval or issuance of grant awards of last year, we are slightly ahead of schedule, on the average, at this time. The state advisory councils, for your interest, are at the point where thirty-one have their budgets approved. We still have a few with problems or certification of their membership.

The fourth major issue I want to deal with is what I call departmental and Bureau issues. You have heard about the new Department of Education from

Jean Frohlicher. If and when the legislation for a new Department of Education passes, we will move into a time-line which requires the president to name or designate a new secretary of education within thirty days of the passage of the act. Within 180 days of that time, we must be into the new Department of Education configuration. The conference report does provide for an assistant secretary for vocational and adult education.

The more important issue with respect to Department and Bureau is the following: We have a limit on our commissioner's discretionary funding of $10 million each year for the next two funding years, '80 forward funded to '81 and '81 forward funded to '82. It is our hope that in the next appropriation, we will go back to the full five percent. Much of that may have to do with how the department shapes up and how the new youth employment legislation comes forward. I will be able to say some things to you about that a little later.

In the Bureau, we are establishing a new branch in the Division of Vocational and Technical Education. It will be tentatively titled Equity and Access Program Support. We will, for the first time, have a staff dealing with special populations programs such as the disadvantaged, the handicapped, and bilingual programs. Our sex equity program specialist and our displaced homemakers and older Americans specialist will likely be there. We will also eventually develop an area in correctional education. If we can get some new staff under the requirements of our participation in the OCR guidelines process, some of them, but not all, will also be located there. Staffing remains a problem in the Bureau. We are now over ceiling, but did not carry them out. They reduced those ceilings subsequently, so we will not have achieved the 50 percent increase, by any measure, over what it was in 1972 or 1973. You are also going to see a new emphasis on postsecondary in our bureau, and we are going to do some restructuring again within the DVTE.

The fifth general topic I would like to cover is new and recent issues--things that have come along in the last several months. The most important of them, perhaps, is the OCR guidelines process. You are quite clearly aware, I know, that those plans of administration are due March 21, 1980. Most of you know that a pilot project has been developed in which four states and Guam have been selected to participate. They will be drawing up model plans of administration, I hope, in time so that they can be of value to you in developing your own plans of administration. We don't know if we can deal with any slippages of time in this or not. We are under court order in this case. We are going to press on the training component. OCR is very slowly going through the process of putting out a contract which will provide training for state department personnel, regional office personnel, and our own federal central personnel in dealing with the Office of Civil Rights effort and the three laws and more that will be involved. Our roles will involve a major thrust in technical assistance to states and the initial review and recommendation of your plans of administration to the Office of Civil Rights.

I must say to you as state directors, that I think the most important variables in whether or not the OCR effort is a successful one in vocational education are your attitudes and intentions. (Vocational education again is the forerunner for all of education as we have been with other social issues in the last two or three years.) How you approach this, with what kind of wisdom and openess, will make much more difference than any guidelines or procedures we might hand out. We intend, for our part, to be eminently thorough and totally consistent and to provide well-trained staff for fully adequate technical assistance. That is our committment to you. It is that important an issue for us, and not simply because it is a justice issue or the result of a court case, but rather because we are absolutely dedicated to equality and civil rights, as we know you are. We would like to demonstrate to you a very positive attitude and ask that you move in that direction as well. By the way, there will be a paper on the background and the history of this whole effort coming from Gail Minor Smith very shortly. She had hoped to have it completed for us by this conference so we could give it to you personally. I think some of us do not know the history of all of this, how it came down. All you have ever seen are the guidelines and some of the background work which Jim Reid worked on early in the process.

The sixth major issue is energy. Most of you know, the Future Farmers of America, one of our eight vocational student organizations, was challenged by the president at the White House last July to be the first student organization to respond to his energy initiative and to do something of a profound nature with it. He promised to reward the FFA chaper that did the best job with a Presidential Citation next July. With the help of Jim, our liaison to the Coordinating Council for Vocational Student Organizations, we have attempted to involve all vocational student organizations in this effort. This idea has been well received at the White House. There are many non-vocational student organizations interested in this too, perhaps as many as fifty or sixty. The students, the young people of this country, are going to be given a special opportunity, with leadership coming from vocational education student organizations, as we see it, to promote the energy initiative of the president. Really, it's an issue of this country, not just the administration.

I have sent forward to Secretary Harris for the president's review, a memo suggesting the notion that vocational education curriculum be modestly overhauled to teach energy saving practices within each occupational preparation program. I would like to get some feedback on this from you. I believe we have the system to do it without a great deal of additional funding, although we would expect to put some money into the effort. We have a national network of curriculum centers, two or three major consortia, curriculum development consortia (at least one of which is represented here), a teacher education system, a national center, a capacity in our state funding to use dollars for curriculum development under Subpart Three, and (I think) the available resources to do it. I need your reaction to that notion and your advice on it.

Sex equity, a seventh point, continues to be an issue. I think we are making progress and I would be remiss if I did not ask you, once again, to reinforce the position of the coordinator in your state as a coordinator--not a doer only--of sex equity activities. Barbara Bitters, who was one of two sex equity coordinators in the state of Wisconsin, (she was working with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction's office) has agreed to come into our office as IPA for one year and become our senior advisor on women's issues. She will work directly for me and will be giving leadership in the Washington community and around the country on the issues of sex equity and equality related to women's issues and the elimination of sex stereotyping in vocational education.

There are a lot of things you said to us, in your writings, through Monte's survey. I am only going to comment briefly that we will make efforts to be less fault finding and more supportive in our reviews of your plans and your MERC/Q's. We will try to foster better communications by strengthening our partnership with you, putting out the policy memos in a more timely way, giving you more lead time to respond to the federal notices of all kinds that come from our offices, being more consistent with regulations interpretations and developing new capacities in our more recently hired staff.

Two final issues I think are probably of much importance to you, at least from the perspective of the theme of this conference--the reauthorization of the vocational education legislation is my eighth topic, and ninth and last, the youth employment legislation which you have heard a great deal about already. The reauthorization process is one in which the Bureau is trying to fix itself as a coordinator and facilitator of the discussion. We want to be an anchor spot or a pivot point for those agencies, institutions, and other individuals who want to influence legislation. The American Vocational Association is moving rapidly forward, in my view, with their plan for legislation, and we have tried to keep in touch with that through regular and appropriate meetings with AVA. We represent the administration. There are the Congress, the lobby groups, and the Department of Justice. You put all of these together and you have got to develop somehow a system that brings the major issues to one point of agreement. If you do not, clearly what you are going to have is seven or eight different versions of the law. Congress looks at those as they did three years ago and says, "What do we have here? The heck with all of that, we'll write our own." The result was 94-482 which contains laws within laws. It has inconsistencies which make it very difficult to manage at the state level, let alone at the federal level. Much of this is because our involvement in that process as vocational educators and leaders was not the kind of involvement that I think we need and want. We have made available to you the first step in that process in reaching out to you for your comments.

You as state directors, should have received, a packet with four monographs and a bibliography. This is the first of a series of mailings we will make from our office. We will attempt to bring the input you send us into the process of developing the major threshold issues which we will ultimately put forward in a draft of legislation about a year from now. Our target date is November 1, 1980. Your participation in that process is absolutely critical. You are going to get asked by a lot of people to make input. You may want to make copies of what you develop, because the AVA, the NEA, the AF of T, the Chief

State School Officers, the APGA, and all of the other organizations who see vocational education as something they want to be part of are going to be interested. And, all of this is fine, so long as we all can agree at some point in this process. It has got to be anchored somewhere so that some organization, whether it be AVA or BOAE, can put together something most of us can agree upon. Besides the issues, the new federal role, that you must deal with here, at least in one of your task groups this afternoon, may be the most critical thing we have to achieve.

With respect to HEW's role, I can only promise you that I will do everything within my power and the resources of our Bureau to deal effectively with that system (or the new system). Some in that system do not want( and will not listen to) anymore rhetoric. I cannot go forward with my line of rhetoric without the backup of data--information, success stories, failures, and problems--that you have produced over the last ten or twelve years, particularly within the last two or three years. This time, we are giving ourselves enough lead time, I think, from the standpoint of the administration. With your participation, we can convince our detractors and our nay sayers without shouting at them, without calling them names, without falling into the rattlesnake pits, without being defensive about preserving our historical turf, but by being resourceful, energetic and practical with respect to the information we give. We will win this battle. We will lose a few skirmishes in the process. This leads me to the youth employment legislation.

With a lot of help from Ann, Tom, Thaine, Lee, and a dozen other folks in our Bureau, we were able to put together a proposal on vocational education that went up, in the last week or so, to Secretary Harris. She signed off on it after it was modified somewhat at other levels. Our proposal is pretty much intact. It does not have the big bucks in it we wanted. Now, I don't know how much money is there. It's anywhere from $0 to $4 billion dollars. Those are the two ranges. I will say this to you right now--I will not agree to, and will fight against, any legislation for youth employment which has vocational education as a part of it, but does not provide additional funds. We will not put ourselves in the posture of being second on the ladder to the Department of Labor or any other federal agency in the initial source of the funds. If we are going to make real the Rosenberg rhetoric of full partnership, it has to be with authority of law and our own dollars, not someone else's dollars.

I can tell you about the present proposal. It has a major urban/rural theme. It has a basic skills piece that would be somewhat like modification of ESEA Title I, which they have called Basic Skills/Employability. The vocational education peice comes in two parts--one is the urban/rural effort and the second is a much expanded cooperative work experience effort program. I am not at liberty to tell you much more than that. I will not say any more about it at this time.

With respect to Rosenberg's talk this morning, I have already made my comment about the funding and the separate legislation or the authority within the vocational education domain. Janet touched very lightly on the dysfunction that exists between the labor system and the education system with respect to lack of state agency control in the CETA enterprise. She should have touched on it much more strongly, because it has been one of our major points of discussion in the task force meetings and in our discussions with Bob Taggart. Ican assure you that any funds coming out of this will not be redirected funds from the present availability under 94-482 as far as I am concerned. Any that do come, will come down through the state system, not up through the CETA system. Education is going to have the dollars; and the full partnership responsibility controls the funds--at least, at the state level.

People in Labor, as you heard this morning, are still taking their role in training. They are still telling us what to do in postsecondary education, and they are still failing to recognize the full potential of vocational education delivery systems. They have listened too much, in my view, to economists. They have listened too much to uninformed people. Now, some of that is our own fault. We did not really find out who the critics were early enough to drag them out. Let them walk through vocational education programs and spend some time to find out what is really happening. You have to do that, it seems to me, in lieu of having good hard data. We keep saying, "Well, we are gearing up NOICC, and we are gearing up VEDS." The Congress and the writers of legislations say, "But what do you have right now?" Well, what we have right now is a pretty good track record in co-op and a pretty good track record in specialized school training at the postsecondary level. It is hard to talk about secondary education in terms of the specific economic variables which interest these people. We are dealing with an economics mentality more than anything else. Those are not disclaimers, but positions I hold and will protect and if I cannot protect them, and cannot win most of them, then I will have lost the battle and will no longer be effective where I am in this role. That is not meant to sound sad or to get anybody's sympathy; but unless we win big in the youth employment legislation, there is a chance for that second system to emerge and direct the first system. I think we are in a position to have some influence on that.

Finally, let me address one last topic which I called at one time, the "Politics of Change, " otherwise known as "Renewing the State/Federal/Local Partnership." I have talked a lot about this around the country. I have had a good response at the local level. I have heard good things about who we are as vocational educators and vocational students in terms of outcomes--more so when I get to states and local communities than I do when I listen to all the doomsayers in Washington. Yet, I am optimistic. We do have a strong linkage to you, perhaps as strong as it has ever been. I am talking about NASDVE. Jim and I meet once a month regularly with four or five other people. We have been very, very faithful to our meetings with Gene Bottoms and Ray Parrot. We have added Gary Eyre, Executive Director of the Adult Education Advisory Council to our meetings. Bob meets with us, too. We don't make policy for one another; we air our concerns and our problems and bring one another up-to-date. I think that level of interaction is part of the re-strengthening of this partnership. The rest of it is the kind of thing that all of you right here in front of me do. Clarence calls me up quite often and says, "How's the partnership coming?" or "What are you doing about it?" Gentry writes me tough letters saying "The rhetoric isn't enough; the philosphy is screwed up like your plumbing." People like our friend from

New York, Jerry, have been very persistent about getting some right answers and have been very generous when we have been slow to give them. That is what it takes! It takes the conflict and the pressure sometimes to renew that partnership. The same thing applies, of course, to you with your locals. I will give you no advice on that except to hope that you understand that the problems you experience there, (state people dealing with local), very much parallel the problems you have from day to day dealing with us and we with you.

The American Vocational Association is a part of the politics that has changed. The renewing of this partnership has become a new, powerful force in Washington. The test of this is the respect, perhaps even the concern in a positive way, for Mary Berry, the Assistant Secretary of Education and the person who is really running the Office of Education. Mary Berry's in a very pivotal position. Where is she going to go in the new Department of Education? We do not know. I really believe, however, the AVA's new power base is very important to the people like Mary Berry above me in HEW. That is important for you to know because what we cannot have is single-issue politics lobbying.

One thing that is great about AVA, so far at least, is that it has kept its' "act together," which is absolutely critical. You heard Sam speak to that this morning. Ted Kennedy said over a year ago that what is destroying the democratic system in this country is single-issue politics. If we break ourselves up as AVA into fifteen or twenty sub-organizations and we let the Jims and Sams run around and do single-issue politics on their pet issue for the state directors, the agriculture teachers, the home economics teachers, and everybody else, we are going to fail--absolutely and as assuredly as I'm standing here. We cannot let that happen. We need to be thankful for Gene Bottoms and others who are keeping it together. I mean that very sincerely. This power base is a new strength for vocational education and we have got to learn how to use it proactively, with vision and sharpness, to get into the system. We have got the right people there. We have strong lobbying capacity. The policits of change require continuation of strong state leadership. I was in the state of Oregon three days or so ago and spoke to the state board. I told them I thought that they, like a dozen other states, are going to suffer through the loss of position and responsibility for their state leadership in vocational education. People are messing around with the system. We cannot let it happen. Here again, you have got to get the political base behind you, in your state as well as in the nation, to forestall that.

I see the new politics of change moving toward more discretion in states, more in-state planning, less out-of-state regulations, a shifting federal management role in a support system rather than a regulatory agency--a whole lot of things. I see the new coalitions, coalitions of older Americans, the Hispanics, or the private and public education sectors, the education/industry/ business liaison. I see better evaluation. I can tell you some shocking stories about you. The first review of our accountability report indicates that only twenty-seven states are making a major, if any, effort in the requirements of Sections 104.402 and #.404 in program evaluation. Fourteen are initially reviewed as being poor, eleven are more quantity than quality, and twelve states conducted none. Those twelve states will be hearing from us with respect to the quality review letter. That is about a fifty percent effort. If you have not received a letter from us in terms of technical assistance and guidance, then that is partly our fault. However, it is the result of the evaluation in the final analysis that gives us the hard data we absolutely have to have to win these skirmishes, and perhaps the larger battles.

To paraphrase him a bit, Sam Halperin said this morning with respect to the future, we have to be willing to take the risk to sacrifice personal gain for gain of the larger society. I do not want to leave you this morning feeling a bit shocked and depressed about all that was laid on you. I am not saying it was good, bad, or indifferent. It was such a load of information that we could continue moving through this conference thinking we are all bad, and we all have irreconcilable and unsolvable problems. I want to say to you, the spirit of the vocational educator is what has gotten us where we are today--not into trouble, but into a viable, productive, useful system of education and employability-development. It serves 17 million people and has garnered more state dollars and local dollars than any other federal venture in education in the history of this country. It is healthy, it is viable, it works. That is what we have to to build on as our base. The problems will worry us from day to day. If we want to look ahead ten years, with any acuity at all, we must recognize that we will deal with problems daily with the kind of spirit and the kind of extra dedication for which we are known. We are giving to people rather than taking from people; we ought not to let ourselves be put in the posture, then, of being taken. Thank you.

## FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

### By Eugene Bottoms*

In terms of the $100 million plus appropriations, there is nothing yet on the books to cut the appropriation in education. In fact, on the Senate side, the education appropriation is slightly below what the budget committee had set up for it. Now what does all that mean? It means that as the time for getting the appropriations to meet that budget match gets closer things will get tough. We're going to have to be alert. I think rather than a continued letter writing campaign, I would suggest a personal call weekly or every other week to your senators or key persons in Congress -- just a call to let them know you're counting on them, that you really need those dollars to put your programs in order. I urge you to help us keep that contact in the field because it really makes a difference when, for example, Joe Mills calls Lawton Chiles' office -- when a state director calls another senator. These people respond immediately, and you ought to know that you can get that positive response from them. My advice is to keep that kind of weekly touch. I don't think it will overburden them to have you call just to find out how it's going, how it's looking, and to tell them that we are counting on their help to hold this particular effort.

Now on the youth initiative, on the possibility of a youth title in vocational education, I'm not sure that I can read the Washington scene for you, but I will try to tell you what I think is going on. Your letter to Hawkins and Perkins have, I think, successfully stalled the Hawkins effort to vote out his bill this fall, and it has created some dialogue. In fact, maybe Wes said it very well awhile ago, "What you think you have one day, the next day you may not have." But Perkins indicated to a group of us about three weeks ago that he supported the effort of an education component and of an amendment to vocational education legislation.

---

*Eugene Bottoms is Executive Director of the American Vocational Association, Arlington, Virginia.

I don't get some of the comments from members of Congress and some of our staff about vocational education that the previous speaker summarized. Now I guess I represent the establishment so I don't expect to get those. But what I find among legislators in general is more confidence in vocational education than in some of the other delivery systems. I'm also finding some support to increase the funding on the education side to address some of these problems. But I believe that labor must have read this in recent weeks and exerted their influence to cut $350 million out of the public service CETA jobs legislation on the senate side. There have been about three publications coming out in the last six weeks primarily from different labor groups on these longitudinal studies, all taking a very shallow look at the data and drawing inaccurate conclusions on the "ineffectiveness" of vocational education. And some members of the non vocational education community, instead of digging into those studies and looking at the real background, have tended to accept those interpretations as fact. So I think there may be an effort underway to divide the education community on this funding issue. We have taken the position that vocational education does not divide the education community.

We did not necessarily want the basic skills at the secondary level if somebody in education would get concerned about this youth effort. We have been trying to get other areas involved, but we really haven't found anyone who believes that some of the money is going to come into the education community. But we are certainly willing to work with the rest of the education community if they are serious about getting the focus on basic skills and linking that to job preparation and on-the-job training -- given a title in the vocational education legislation that would provide program dollars for vocational education as well as some dollars to strengthen our capacity in communities where at the present time we do not have the capacity to serve these youth.

The American Federation of Teachers through Al Shenker's leadership has involved some of the bigger organizations. Shenker recently pointed out that not only is labor taking over job-skill preparation, but through the community-based organizations in New York City, they are beginning to make major inroads into the secondary schools, to take over the teaching of basic skills in other areas. I think that is what has motivated the AFT to get into this. We had been trying to work with a number of the educational associations and had their commitment on some things. AFT asked if Shenker would take the lead in this area, and we have been at all those meetings to share and be a part of the total educational community. What they have agreed upon as a tentative umbrella statement is a basic skill initiative at the secondary level and then an initiative on vocational education that would cut across both in-school and out-of-school youth for skills training and on-the-job training through cooperative programs that might be created. We had to push them beyond thinking in terms of the secondary school to get both out-of-school and the in-school youth, but we got some help from some others in the education community on that.

I'm not real sure about the administration or labor commitment to vocational education but we got some very good response from many of the congressmen. They definitely want an education focus. Nobody else from education testified. I think maybe the Chiefs testified on this employability plan, but they didn't call for the money being left exactly where it is. I think maybe some of them said, "Well, look, if you're going to let vocational education pick up all this money, the rest of education needs to get involved."

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has gone forward with their proposal, and I think I can tell you what's in it. It's a billion and a half dollar package. They seem to have had some understanding with the administration that they could come in at that level. I think that is all part of the game of trying to get Jim McIntyre to push up the amount of money. He isn't talking about that much new money altogether. They have a $750 million basic skill package as part of Title I, ESEA, Secondary focus. Almost all of their package is secondary focus. They have a $300 million package for vocational education -- both programs and capacity development in depressed rural and urban communities -- that is predominantly secondary. We have been trying to persuade them that it ought to be secondary and post secondary. Then there is either $25 or $50 million in a cooperative vocational education package. There is $150 million in basic adult education, somewhere in the neighborhood of $100 million in higher education in the Upward Bound program, and $100 million in development and demonstration. Now, I think that's close to one and a half billion dollars. Basically that is the HEW proposal which I'm sure will have to get scaled down and packaged so it can be looked at.

We met yesterday with Bert Carp who is the Vice President's person on the domestic council and one of the people who worked hard last year to get the $200 million back. Of course we were the only vocational educators there; the rest of the education group sitting around the table were in general education. He said, basically, the new component -- the new dollars in the youth effort -- will come down the education side. This is a signal we have been reading continuously. But he said we are also looking at targeting some money through vocational education. I said to him after the meeting, "Bert, it sure would help if you would put both of those amendments in the same context with equal force when you talk to groups. It would make me feel a little more sure about where we are located."

Jack Rose has for you a copy of an article that was in the New York Times, and I want to share it with you because I think this article will give us a little clue about where the administration may be going and probably what we need to do. I get the feeling that somebody is doing some trading along the way to give a major emphasis on basic skills at the secondary level, and as part of this they are willing to trade off everything else that would still remain under labor, particularly vocational education components. I don't think that is firm, and I think there is a split in domestic council staff itself as to how things will go.

Most of you should have received on July 31 a basic outline of what we have been trying to work toward. We have had some of you look at a first draft of an amendment to vocational education legislation. I have a second draft which I left with Clarence. Maybe he could get that reproduced so that all the state directors can have a copy. This is the posture I hope you would take on it. Give me a marked-up version of how it can be improved. This is not a final cut but a growing document trying to link vocational education and the CETA system together with some money coming through vocational education. We have talked to people on the Hill and are quite convinced that they are not going to put the money down the education side unless those two systems touch base somewhere along the way.

# SECTION THREE:
## The Charge and the Challenge for Vocational Education

# THE CHARGE AND THE CHALLENGE FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by Rupert Evans*

I was asked, as part of this program to give you a challenge. Challenges are never easy--but then, life is never easy. Nobody ever said it was easy and for certain, your job is not easy. I calculate that it takes a minimum of ten years for a state director to begin to perform at maximum efficiency. If that's at all true, with the rate of turnover we've been having, we are performing at somewhat less than maximum efficiency. But on the other hand, I think there is no job in vocational education that develops people faster than yours does. I hope one of the things you'll be thinking about in your Association is taking a look at what has happened to ex-state directors to see if we are using well some of those talents that were developed so rapidly and, in most cases, discarded prematurely.

The challenge comes to the Association as much as to any individual because the work we have to do is tough, and it's getting tougher. But I think we are getting a better crop of people. For example, the EPDA crop is bright and has a good background. They still need some on-the-job training, but they're getting it. Unfortunately, there are not enough good people to go around, and there are going to be even fewer. This is even a good time to have babies. I don't know whether you recognize it or not, but whenever there is little competition in an age group because few are being born, that's the best time to have babies. They're going to have little competition for the rest of their lives. Most of us have been faced with high levels of competition from large numbers of people most of our lives. We face the competition of the middle-aged and, of course, that's one of our major problems--we have too many of them.

But society, until now, has been mostly concerned about its youth. I see the current demand for accountability primarily as based on a societal concern for conservation of youth abilities, because youth is always precious to society. When youth is in short supply (and people are beginning to recognize that youth will be in short supply in the labor force and in other societal institutions), then people get concerned about it. In Japan, youth who are willing to go to work are referred to as "golden eggs" and the Japanese mean exactly that, because they are the golden eggs which will pay the way for all of the rest of society. Bill Miernyk was talking about conservation of nonreproducible matter. Youth, of course, are reproducible. In fact, they can be produced by young, unskilled labor. One of our problems is that undoubtedly some of the labor that has been producing them has been a little too young and too unskilled. But youth is a finite resource at any given time.

---

* Rupert Evans is Professor of Vocational and Technical Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Let me tell you that one of my major concerns about the conservation of youth resources has to do with the development of NOICC and SOICCs. Conceivably they can say to us, as a depression or a recession is coming on, that there are no job opportunities, no job vacancies; therefore, we should stop training. There is an unfounded assumption that you can put this precious resource of youth in a refrigerator and keep it there until you see a need for jobs and then turn on the training. That isn't the way it works.

Everybody should know, (but many don't) that the best time to do training is during a recession. That's a time when you can get the most qualified instructors at lower salaries. It's a time when many people are not going to be otherwise employed. Also, you can get capable students easily, because you can take people off unemployment payments and put them into training. We ought to be doing far more training during recessions than we do during peak periods, but we always do it exactly the other way around. Especially during a recession, it seems to me that our goal ought to be to train all youth and adults who want training, or who can be persuaded to want it. Moreover, it's far better to train people for skilled work of any type and then transfer them to other skilled work than it is to give them no training and then, when you suddenly need them, to take these unskilled, illiterate, unusable people and try suddenly, overnight, to turn them into the skilled workers you need.

Related to this is the concept of "value added" by vocational education. Our traditional evaluation of vocational education is in terms of the value of the finished product. Throughout the discussions of this week, I have heard over and over again, under the surface, a blurring of this distinction. Surely we want to turn out first-rate finished products but there are different ways to do this. You know, in most countries now (not in this one yet, but we can look for it any day) they have started to tax the value added by manufacturers and distributors. They calculate the value of your raw materials before you do something to it. Then they calculate the value of the finished product that you turn out. The difference between what you started out with and what you end up with is the value that you added to it. And since tax people are always finding things to tax, they have figured out that "value added" is a perfect thing to tax. Certainly, it makes more sense than some of our other taxes.

But look at this in terms of vocational education and the value it adds to its students. Which students can we add the most value to? I hear some of us saying, "Give us the students who need as little training as possible, the ones who are easiest to train, the ones who are highly motivated--we like to work with them." Well, those are the easy ones to work with. But, I'm not at all sure they are the ones to whom we will add the most value. In some of these discussions, I have heard people say we ought to abandon the increasing percentage of high school students who are dropouts, that we ought to move toward serving the motivated, the people with a solid, basic education. I heard some discussion awhile ago that seemed to suggest not only abandoning the potential dropouts, but shutting the door on those people who have left school for one reason or another and who want to come back in. I hope we don't go in that direction.

I hear Apker talking about moving more and more toward postsecondary vocational education and ignoring or maybe welcoming an increase in the rate of dropouts from secondary schools. The chief state school officer of this magnificent state was quoted in the newspaper yesterday as recommending that we get rid of the compulsory attendance law in order, I suppose, to make things easier on school folk. But when officials talk that way, I don't think they are considering the value they have the potential to add to youth.

There is no question in my mind that postsecondary education turns out more capable individuals than does any other type of education. Of course, considering the types of students that most postsecondary institutions attract, you would have to work awfully hard not to make them look good. They're motivated, they're interested, and they achieve personal gain by attending. But what about the payoff to society? What about the value added in terms of what society needs? I think this varies enormously from one institution to another. One thing we can be sure of--we can't continue to have good technical institute instruction when new graduates are earning more than their instructors are. We have that situation in quite a number of places.

I mentioned other countries in terms of the way they're moving in taxation. I wish we would think about other countries in terms of what was mentioned briefly, but not elaborated on--the Reindustrialization of America. We seem to be proud of the fact that we have about one-third of our workers producing goods and two-thirds producing services that we're moving into a service economy. Some people seem to think this is a millennium. Well, I'm not at all sure it is a millennium. We don't know much about how to increase productivity in the service sector, and I am convinced that one of the reasons we have a smaller and smaller proportion of our labor force involved in manufacturing is because we have lost manufacturing jobs to other countries. We seem to be in a cycle of importing finished goods and exporting food, jobs, and technology. I don't think that's a millennium at all and I think we ought to do something about it. If we had more productivity, more jobs would be brought back here, and though we don't like to admit it, they would be brought back to a land of low taxes and low inflation. We like to think we have high taxes and high inflation, but compared to the rest of the world, this is pretty nearly paradise.

One of the solutions that some economists have come up with is to export training. They say that if we can export training, we can help balance the foreigh exchange budget. But I see the State Department, for example, negotiating an agreement with Nigeria to bring in thousands of Nigerians for training in vocational education in some of the best schools they can identify in this country. They are particularly interested in community colleges that happen to have low enrollments and good entrepreneurs in charge of their vocational training programs. This leads to such examples as an ag-machinery course with two locals in it and eighteen Nigerians. Some of the local taxpayers are a bit unhappy about that because the state department wants to pay only "out of the district" tuition. They don't want to pay full costs. Certainly this doesn't add much to the balance of payments account. Now, compare that with what our ARAMCO has done with training. I don't know if you have noticed any of their full-page ads for vocational instructors (incidentally, that's another place where some of our instructors are going). The Arabian-American Oil Company is being paid and paid handsomely for the vocational training they are providing. They pay the instructors handsomely and they are earning money for this country by providing vocational training to foreign nationals. They're getting back from the Saudi's and other oil-rich countries some of the dollars we have been paying for oil. This reminds me of an old song, "They're selling what they used to give away." If we're serious about exporting training, I think we have to sell it and sell it for value, not give it away.

We need a national policy on this and the Association of State Directors ought to be concerned about it. Otherwise, the State Department, which is naturally interested in foreign negotiations and improving foreign policy, will whipsaw you by pitting one state against another, one district against another, in trying to find the cheapest training.

Talking about pitting one state against another and nation against nation, I am so pleased to see this group moving toward the recognition that there are differences among national goals for vocational education--federal goals for vocational education, and state goals for vocational education. However, I haven't heard directly mentioned things such as, "Providing vocational education across state lines is a national goal." It ought also to be a federal goal, but I don't see much evidence that it is. Since state directors are concerned about national goals as well as about goals for their home state, I hope that that's something to which you'll begin to pay even more attention. And you might want to think about the very touchy topic of state goals that come into conflict with national goals. It is clearly not in the national interest to have State A steal jobs from State B if there are no other considerations. And yet, that is an explicit state goal of vocational education in many, perhaps all, states.

Increasingly, we're getting state legislation to meet state goals for vocational education. I think that is as it should be. We will have problems with it, with the feds trying to come up with a requirement for maintenance of effort, trying to manipulate the federal dollars so that for every dollar they spend, they can spend ten dollars of other people's money. I suppose if I were in their shoes, I'd do the same thing as I tried to achieve federal goals. Who is it then who looks to the achievement of national goals in vocational education? Well, certainly, if there's any group better qualified than NASDVE or AVA, I don't know what it is.

I mentioned Apker a minute ago, but I must return to him because he said a couple of things that just tore me up. Generally it was a good speech, I thought, but I surely disagreed when he said that home economics education is not vocational education. I know some of you who seem to share that view, or act as if you do. But, I don't, and I'll tell you why I don't. I see vocational education as being concerned primarily with preparing people for work, and anybody who says it's so simple that it doesn't require any education is out of his or her "cotton-pickin' mind." So, if home economics includes education for work in the home, then it's a concern of vocational education.

78

Secondly, he concluded that agricultural education ought to be deemphasized because ag-production jobs have decreased somewhat, and horticulture enrollments have gone up. Unfortunately, he didn't recognize that there are agricultural jobs and agricultural vocational education in addition to the jobs and the education directly related to farming. He just said that ag employment is down and ag enrollment is up. He didn't recognize that it's ag-production jobs that have gone down and horticulture enrollments that have gone up.

I'm learning a little bit of agricultural education on the job. Down on the farm a couple of weeks ago, two young farmers (in their early twenties) were asking our tenant for help on some farming problems they had, and he helped them. Then he said to them and to me, "This represents two-thirds of the young farmers in Bartholomew County. All the rest of us are over fifty." Mr. Apker and we, had better be concerned about that, because it's not just the number of jobs that have gone down, it's what is happening to the age distribution within the agricultural labor force.

I haven't heard much here today about a topic I have heard from time to time in other forums about the standardization of instruction from one state to another and from one locality to another. Maybe I just missed it in your discussions. Standardized instruction is an appealing concept. It's one of the concepts behind the notion of regional curriculum centers. It's behind the notion that we ought to have a national testing program for determination of competence in vocational education. It's appealing, but let me remind you that if we are going to have standardization of instruction (and I can see some cons as well as some pros) we must do something about instructor training. The provision of standard instruction requires that instructors have common experiences, but a very high proportion of our instructors have been trained on the job and have acquired skills on the job. Slowly, it is beginning to be recognized that on-the-job training, unfortunately, promotes diversity rather than standardization of experience.

When the Federal Aviation Agency wants to be sure that all flight controllers behave exactly the same way when they contact an airplane, the FAA sends them to school. And then, of course, they go back on the job where immediately the diversity begins to develop. They all start to develop little differences in approach; they come up with different ways of handling things. Some of the new ways may be even more efficient than what they've been taught by the FAA. But the FAA has to have standardization, so it sends them back to school--to a formal education program to give them common experiences that lead to standardization. This also means that all of the FAA instructors must go, repeatedly, to school. Now, we haven't thought about the need for that when we have talked about standardization of instruction in vocational education.

It's not just our instructors who are generally trained on the job; our administrators are also typically trained on the job. If on-the-job training promotes diversity instead of standardization, don't be surprised, then, if our administrators behave in different ways and respond to federal directives in different ways. Again, this isn't all bad. I'm just saying that if you want standardization, you must think about providing some sort of commonality of experiences such as those you're providing right here--some common experiences that bring us together. And don't forget that standardization of instruction clearly conflicts with moves toward local autonomy.

Now finally, we come to CETA. I never said it was easy, but please don't give away out-of-school instruction to CETA or to anyone else. Some people say there are two kinds of in-school youth. There are the kids who have never left school, and there are the kids who have left school for one reason or another and have come back. I always thought they were the same breed of cat, but I guess they're not. Then there are the out-of-school youth, some of whom want instruction that can be provided in the school but they don't want to come back to school to get it. Surely we don't want to give up on the kid who had dropped out of school and then has come back voluntarily and said, "How about fitting me into a program?" I see you every day accommodating these people, and you're doing it well. But more than that, I'm saying don't give up on the person who has dropped out of school or who has been forced out of school and needs and wants something that can be provided through school-like experiences outside of school. That's why we have outreach centers. That's why we have storefront schools. School people, properly motivated, can run those better than community organizations or anybody else. If we can't, there's something wrong with us. Formal instruction, organized instruction, evaluated instruction is something that ought to be our "cup of tea." That ought to be ours regardless of where it is provided or who is paying for it. We should not want to give it up just to make life a little easier.

I've been talking to quite a number of prime sponsors recently. I participated in a recently completed study by the National Council on Employment Policy in which we were looking at linkages between schools and prime sponsors. We talked to lots of people in prime sponsor organizations and found that they have an increasing realization that they don't know how to do training. They also have an increasing realization that training is needed, that they want help, and that they want help from schools. That's why in some places the prime sponsors gave 100 percent (instead of the mandated 22 percent) of YETP money to local education agencies. Nationally, the figure was 50 percent. They want help from the schools. In administrative circles in Washington it's a different "kettle of fish" and in some state capitals it's a different "kettle of fish." They don't want schools involved because they don't know what schools can do. But most prime sponsors want help from schools because they know what some schools are doing.

The United States Department of Labor wants a training function. They've always wanted a training function. But federal legislation (in spite of what their representatives said) has been aimed at building bridges between CETA and vocational education, especially at the local level. But legislation also seems to be trying to get a division of responsibility in which vocational education would handle the training and CETA would handle on-the-job learning experiences. Now, I'm a little queasy about such a division of effort. I think one of the biggest strengths we've had is in the co-op program. And I think a major reason for this strength has been the linkage between the in-school and out-of-school experiences, because they've affected each other and they've given kids what they need. So I'm more than a little queasy about this division of labor, but I think it still has some possibilities. It surely has much greater possibilities than if we said, "We want to turn over to community-based organizations the responsibility for developing the basic educational skills that are needed in employment."

80

We have another problem in Washington--the president's concern with the private sector initiative. We were talking earlier in the week about data that inform and don't inform and about picking the data that you want to support your point of view and forgetting about the rest of the data. We agreed that there are some kinds of data you can't express in figures--data that require you to get out and see what's going on at the firing line.

We do have some data about private sector initiatives in the training of disadvantaged youth and adults. The results were miserable--absolutely miserable. When we have the slightest economic decline, the whole private sector training effort absolutely falls apart. Companies not only don't take on any new trainees, they fire all the ones they have in training, and we have data on this. It's clear, and yet Washington keeps saying, "Let's push private sector initiatives." Why? I don't know. Maybe because some people think there are votes in it, but it may be in part because they just haven't come to recognize how much better it can be done under different arrangements, and because maybe even some of us say occasionally, "I surely wish this burden would go away from us." Some of us really don't want to tackle these hard-to-train folks, so we say, "Let's give it away." I hope you won't give it away.

Darrell asked me to help give you a challenge. Nobody ever said that your job was easy. It looks to me as if it's getting tougher all the time. But you surely have to admit that it's challenging.

# APPENDIX
## EXHIBIT A:
## Conference Agenda

## EXHIBIT B: Program Presenters and Participants

## EXHIBIT A
## CONFERENCE AGENDA

# PROGRAM

## 1979 Fall Leadership Conference
## for State Directors of Vocational Education

"Charting a Course of Excellence for the 80's"

The Safari Hotel

Scottsdale, Arizona
September 24--27, 1979

### Monday, September 24

2:00 - - 6:00 p.m. — REGISTRATION — Hotel Lobby

6:00 - - 7:00 p.m. — RECEPTION — Lobby—Convention Center

Sponsor: Valpar Corporation
Tuscon, Arizona

Host: Tom Brandon, President

7:00 — 9:00 p.m. — CONFERENCE BANQUET — French Quarter Room

Toastperson:
Clarence E. Burdette, President
NASDVE and Assistant State
Superintendent for Vocational
Education, West Virginia

Greetings:
Carolyn Warner, State Superintendent
of Public Instruction, Arizona

PREPARING YOUTH FOR EMPLOYMENT:
THE VIEW FROM THE HILL

Jean Frohlicher, Majority Counsel
Senate Sub-Committee on Education

### Tuesday, September 25

8:30 a.m. — FIRST GENERAL SESSION — Canyon Room

Presider: Gary Bellrichard, Director
of Vocational Education, Arizona

Opening Remarks

Clarence E. Burdette

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | CONFERENCE CHARGE<br>Frank M. Santoro, Deputy Assistant<br>Commissioner for Vocational Education,<br>Rhode Island | |
| 9:00 a.m. | THE DYNAMICS OF THE EIGHTIES<br>William H. Miernyk, Director<br>Regional Research Institute in Economics<br>West Virginia University | |
| 10:00 a.m. | Refreshment Break | |
| 10:15 a.m. | THE FUTURE OF EDUCATION<br>Samuel Halperin, Director<br>Institute for Educational Leadership,<br>The George Washington University | |
| 11:00 a.m. | THE CETA CONNECTION<br>Representative of the Office<br>of Youth Programs<br>United States Department of Labor | |
| 11:30 a.m. | THE REMARKS OF THE MORNING: A SPONTANEOUS ANALYSIS WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION<br>Rupert Evans, Professor of<br>Vocational and Technical Education<br>University of Illinois | |
| 12:00 noon | LUNCHEON<br>Toastperson: Addison S. Hobbs,<br>State Director of Vocational-<br>Technical Education, Maryland | French Quarter Room |
| | WASHINGTON UPDATE<br>Dan Dunham, Deputy Commissioner of Education<br>Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education<br>United States Office of Education | |
| 1:15 p.m. | TASK FORCE CHARGE<br>Frank Santoro | |

1:30 p.m. TASK FORCE MEETINGS

Points to Be Discussed: From this task force's standpoint– Here's what I heard.
Here seem to be the major issues, problems, and concerns.
An appropriate course of action and/or position for this committee to take is . . .

Task Force A (blue): Funding Alternatives — Canyon Room

Chairperson: Gerald Freeborne
Recorder: William Wenzel

Task Force B (green): National Purpose — Sandlewood Room

Chairperson: Joseph Freund
Recorder: Joe Mills

Task Force C (yellow): Role of Vocational Education — Ironwood Room

Chairperson: James Galloway
Recorder: Glen Strain

Task Force D (red): Federal/State Relationships — French Quarter Room

Chairperson: Monty Multanen
Recorder: Homer Halverson

4:30 p.m. NASDVE BUSINESS MEETING — Canyon Room

Presider: Clarence E. Burdette, President
NASDVE

5:30 p.m. Valpar Hospitality Hour — TBA

Wednesday, September 26

8:30 a.m. SECOND GENERAL SESSION — Canyon Room

Presider: Wilma Ludwig, State Director
for Vocational Education,
New Mexico

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | **FEDERAL/STATE/LOCAL LINKAGES: THE DELIVERY OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION**<br>Wesley Apker, Executive Director<br>National Association for State Boards of Education | |
| 10:00 a.m. | Refreshment Break | |
| 10:15 a.m. | **FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE REVIEW**<br>Eugene Bottoms, Executive Director<br>American Vocational Association | |
| 11:00 a.m. | **BUILDING A VOCATIONAL EDUCATION R&D SYSTEM: NEXT STEPS**<br>Robert E. Taylor, Executive Director<br>The National Center for Research in Vocational Education | |
| 11:45 a.m. | **LUNCH** | French Quarter Room |
| 1:00 p.m. | **TASK FORCE MEETINGS CONTINUED**<br>Finalization of draft positions with specific action steps utilizing presentations and discussions of both days | Same as Yesterday |
| 4:00 p.m. | **NASDVE FUTURE DIRECTIONS COMMITTEE MEETING**<br>Presider: Don K. Gentry, Chairperson<br>Task: To review and summarize position statements prepared by task forces | Canyon Room |
| 5:00 p.m. | Valpar Hospitality Hour | TBA |
| 6:00 p.m. | **ARIZONA NIGHT: A CACTUS STEAKFRY** | Hotel Lobby (Transportation will be furnished) |

## Thursday, September 27

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7:00 a.m. | **BREAKFAST**<br>Presider: Carrol E. Bruchinal<br>State Director, Vocational Education, North Dakota | Poolside |

UPDATE: NIE EVALUATION STUDY

Henry David, Director
NIE Evaluation Study

8:30 a.m. THIRD GENERAL SESSION Canyon Room

Presider: Francis T. Tuttle, State Director
of Vocational Education
Oklahoma

8:45 a.m. SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE REPORTS

Don K. Gentry, State Director of
Vocational Education, Indiana

9:15 a.m. THE CHALLENGE

Rupert Evans

10:00 a.m. Refreshment Break

10:15 a.m. CHARTING A COURSE OF EXCELLENCE FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE 80's: NEXT STEPS

Clarence Burdette
Frank Santoro

11:00 a.m. CLOSING REMARKS

Darrell Parks, Director
National Academy for Vocational Education

11:30 a.m. ADJOURNMENT

## EXHIBIT B:
## PROGRAM PRESENTERS AND PARTICIPANTS

## PARTICIPANT LIST

Wesley Apker, Exec. Director
National Association for State
Boards of Education
Washington, D.C. 20001

James C. Athen, Director
Career Education
Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines, IA 50319

David Barrett
Graduate Research Associate
National Center for Research in
Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Samuel L. Barrett, Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Sacramento, CA 95814

Clifton Belcher, State Director
Occupational Education
Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, NC 27611

Gary Bellrichard, Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Bob Bendotti, Ed. Prog. Specialist
State Department of Education
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Charles Benson, Principal Investigator
Project on National Vocational
Education Research
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Walter Bialobrezeski, Asst. Director
Division of Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Hartford, CT 06115

Garry Bice, Research Specialist
National Center for Research in
Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

David S. Bonde, State Director
Division of Vocational-Technical
Education
State Department of Education
Pierre, SD 57501

Eugene Bottoms, Exec. Director
American Vocational Association
Arlington, VA 22201

Fran Boyd, Contract Administrator
State Board of Education
Springfield, IL 62777

Michael Brici, Director
Division of Vocational Education
Department of Public Instruction
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Robert Buck, Director
Trade and Industrial Education
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Carrol E. Burchinal, State Director
Vocational Education
State Office Building
Bismarck, ND 58505

Clarence Burdette, Asst. Supervisor
Bureau of Vocational, Technical and
Adult Education
State Department of Education
Charleston, WV 25305

Wallace Burke, Chief
Administrative Services
Division of Vocational-Technical
Education
Nashville, TN 37219

Richard Carlson
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208

Bill Caston, Exec. Director
State Occupational Information
Coordinating Council
State Department of Education
Jackson, MS 39205

Bob E. Childers, Exec. Secretary
Commission on Occupational
Education Institutions.
Southern Association of Colleges
and Schools
Atlanta, GA 30308

Travis Cliett, Vice President
American Vocational Association
Arlington, VA 22201

LeRoy Corneilson, Director
Division of State Vocational
Programs Operation
Bureau of Occupational and Adult
Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, DC 20202

David F. Cronin, Assoc. Comm.
Occupational Education
State Department of Education
Boston, MA 02116

Daniel Dunham, Deputy Comm.
Bureau of Occupational and
Adult Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Donald E. Dunkle, Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Dover, DE 19901

Ken Eaddy, Director
V-TECS
Southern Association of Colleges
and Schools
Atlanta, GA 30308

Michael Elliott, State Director
Occupational Education
State Department of Education
Cheyenne, WY 82002

Glenn Erickson, Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Juneau, AK 99811

Rupert Evans, Professor
Vocational-Technical Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

Bill Fitz, Administrator
Support Services
Texas Education Agency
Austin, TX 78701

Geneva Fletcher, Deputy State Dir.
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Gerald Freeborne, Asst. Comm.
Occupational and Continuing Ed.
State Department of Education
Albany, NY 12230

Joseph Freund, Asst. Supervisor
Adult and Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Atlanta, GA 30334

Jean Frohlicher, Majority Counsel
Senate Sub-Committee on Education
Washington, D.C. 20003

Ken Gabbert, Director
Program Improvement Services
State Department of Education
Phoenix, AZ 85007

David Gailey, State Director
Vocational Education
State Board of Vocational Education
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

James R. Galloway, State Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Springfield, IL 62777

Melvin H. Garner, State Director
Division of Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Richmond, VA 23116

Don K. Gentry, Director
State Board for Vocational-
Technical Education
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Samuel Halperin, Director
Institute for Educational Leadership
George Washington University
Washington, D.C. 20052

Homer J. Halverson, State Director
Commission for Vocational Education
Olympia, WA 98504

Luther S. Hardin, Assoc. Director
Voc. Tech, and Adult Education
State Department of Education
Little Rock, AR 72201

Marge Harouff, Program Administrator
Department of Education
Lincoln, NE 68509

E. Gareth Hochlander, Director
Project on National Vocational
Education Research
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Addison S. Hobbs, State Director
Division of Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Baltimroe, MD 21240

Charles Hopkins, Asst. State Dir.
Supportive Services
State Department of Education
Stillwater, OK 74074

Toby Jalowsky, Educ. Prog. Specialist
State Department of Education
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Thomas Johns, Director
Legislation and Evaluation Branch
Bureau of Occupational and
Adult Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Otho Jones, Asst. to Superintendent
Career Development Programs
Washington, D.C. 20004

Robert V. Kerwood
Personnel Development Coordinator
State Department of Education
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Larry Key, State Director
Vocational Skills
State Department of Education
Helena, MT 59601

Leonard Kingsley, Superintendent
Penta County Vocational Schools
Perrysburg, OH 43551

George Kosbab
Personnel Development Coordinator
Division of Vocational Education
State Office Building
Columbus, OH 43215

Art Lee, Research Specialist
National Center for Research in
Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Eugene Lehrmann, President-Elect
American Vocational Association
Madison, WI 53711

M.G. Linson, Research Consultant
National Center for Research in
Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Wilma Ludwig, State Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Santa Fe, NM 87503

Joel Magisos, Assoc. Director
National Center for Research in
Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Shirley Mannion, Deputy Assoc. Super.
State Department of Education
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Ann Martin, Assoc. Commissioner
Occupational Planning
Bureau of Occupational and
Adult Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ron McCage, Manager
Research Development Section
Department of Adult, Vocational
and Technical Education
State Department of Education
Springfield, IL 62777

Thane McCormick, Director
Division of Vocational-Technical
Education
Bureau of Occupational and Adult
Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Bill Messer, Asst. Director
Vocational-Technical Education
State Department of Education
Jackson, MS 39205

William H. Miernyk, Director
Regional Research Institute in
Economics
West Virginia University
Morgantown, WV 26506

Joe D. Mills, Director
Div. of Voc. Tech., and Adult
Education
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, FL 32304

Donald Milner, Deputy Director
Vocational-Technical Education
State Department of Education
Jackson, MS 39205

Carlos Moore, Education Director
State Department of Education
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Mark Newton, Research Specialist
National Center for Research in
Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Dewey Oakley, Dir. of Prog. Services
Division of Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Richmond, VA 23216

Ken Olson, Director
Occupational Programs
Division of Program Services
Department of Community Colleges
Raleigh, NC 27611

Moody Oswald, State Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Vocational Education
Columbia, SC 29201

Darrell Parks, Director
National Academy
National Center for Research in
Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Ellen Pearson, Education Prog. Spec.
State Department of Education
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Maria Peterson, Assoc. Director
National Center for Research in
Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Duane Pierce, State Director
Vocational-Technical Education
Concord, NH 03301

Dale Post, Director
Occupational Education Supervision
State Department of Education
Albany, NY 12230

James Reeves, Asst. Director
Vocational-Technical Education
State Department of Education
Jackson, MS 39205

James L. Reid, Exec. Director
National Assoc. of State Dir. of
Vocational Education
Arlington, VA 2220

Carol Rhea, Coordinator
Vocational Education, Adm.
Section
State Department of Education
Topeka, KS 66612

R. Courtney Riley, State Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Carson City, NV 89701

B.W. Robinson, Asst. Comm.
Career and Adult Education
State Department of Education
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Aubrey Roebuck, State Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
St. Thomas, VI 00801

Janet Rosenberg, Spec. Assistant
to the Administrator
Office of Youth Programs
U.S. Department of Labor
Washington, D.C. 20003

Dick Ruff, Director
Research Coordinating Unit
State Department of Education
Phoenix, AZ 85007

John C. Salas, State Director
Division of Careers and Occupations
Guam, Marriana Islands 96912

Edgar Sanchez, Asst. Secretary
Vocational-Technical Education
State Department of Education
Hato Rey, PR 00919

Frank M. Santoro, Deputy Asst. Comm.
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Providence, RI 02908

Larry G. Selland, State Director
Vocational Education
State Board for Vocational Education
Boise, ID 83720

Robert Sorensen, State Director
Vocational Education
Board for Vocational, Technical
and Adult Education
Madison, WI 53702

N. J. Stafford, Jr., Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

Glen H. Strain, Asst. Comm.
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Lincoln, NE 68508

Florence Sutler, Director
Occupational Education, Planning
Research and Evaluation
State Department of Education
Albany, NY 12230

Robert Taylor, Exec. Director
National Center for Research in
Vocational Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, OH 43210

Cecil O. Tower (Retired-formerly
with the Ohio State Dept. of
Education)
Sun City, AZ 85351

Francis T. Tuttle, State Director
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Stillwater, OK 74074

Robert P. Van Tries, Asst. Comm.
Vocational Educaton
State Department of Education
St. Paul, MN 55101

Darrell Ward, Coordinator
Vocational Planning and Evaluation
Department of Education
Salem, OR 97310

William Wenzel, Asst. Comm.
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Trenton, NJ 08625

Elwyn Wheat, State Director
Vocational-Technical Education
Jackson, MS 39205

James W. Wilson, Director
Occupational Education
State Department of Education
Denver, CO 80203